Presented to
United
Theological Seminary
Library
Dayton, Ohio

by

J. Balmer Showers

HARVEY M. SHELLEY
PUBLISHER AND BOOKSELLER
5513 Larchwood Avenue

25

A STUDY OF CHURCH HISTORY

TO THE END OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

Other Books of the Church Tutorial Classes Association

A Study of the Old Testament

By Major J. W. POVAH, B.D., Tutorial Secretary, Church Tutorial Classes Association. Foreword by Canon G. H. BOX, D.D.
Third and Revised Edition, 2s. 6d. net

A Study of the New Testament

By DONALD BRUCE WALKER, B.A., B.D. Foreword by the BISHOP OF JARROW.
2s. 6d. net

A Study of World Evangelisation

By DAVID JENKS, S.S.M., Assistant Secretary, Missionary Council of the Church Assembly. 4s. net; paper, 2s. 6d. net

STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT
32 RUSSELL SQUARE
LONDON, W.C.1

A STUDY OF CHURCH HISTORY

TO THE END OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

BY

G. W. BUTTERWORTH

M. A., LITT. D.

United Theological Seminary
BR
162
.B85
1928
41,323

GARDEN CITY, NEW YORK

DOUBLEDAY, DORAN & COMPANY, INC.

1928

First Published September, 1927

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
THE EDINBURGH PRESS, 9 AND 11 YOUNG STREET, EDINBURGH

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Environment of Early Christianity.	7
II.	The Age of the Gospels	13
III.	The Apostolic Fathers	19
IV.	Persecution and the Apologists . .	27
V.	Gnosticism	36
VI.	The Catholic Church	43
VII.	Alexandria	52
VIII.	Church and State	59
IX.	The Long Peace and the Final Persecution	66
X.	Arianism	74
XI.	The Christological Controversy . .	83
XII.	Four Great Fathers	91
XIII.	Monasticism	102
XIV.	Islam	108
XV.	The Papacy to the Great Schism, 1054 .	115
XVI.	The Papacy from 1054 to the Concordat of Worms, 1122	123
XVII.	The Crusades	130
XVIII.	Monastic Orders and Reforms . .	138
XIX.	Scholasticism	146
XX.	The Universities	154
XXI.	The Papacy from 1122 to the Dawn of Nationalism	160

A STUDY OF CHURCH HISTORY

CHAPTER I

THE ENVIRONMENT OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

I

Judaism.—Of the elements in the environment of early Christianity, Judaism is at once the most primitive and the most powerful. Jesus was a Jew, and his teaching was originally addressed to men who were Jews like himself. It was therefore framed so as to be intelligible and if possible acceptable to them. There was indeed a universalistic note in the teaching of Jesus, different from anything the Jewish people either expected or desired; but he did not press this, being content to let it become apparent in time. Only slowly and with much hesitation did the Church separate itself from Judaism. Even St Paul, the chief agent in this momentous change, allowed fourteen or fifteen years to pass after his conversion before making a direct appeal to the Gentiles;[1] and to the end he worked through Judaism wherever possible.[2] It is unlikely, then, that St Paul introduced into the Church any purely Greek elements, as has sometimes been alleged. The main lines of Christian faith and practice were in all probability laid down

[1] Acts xiii. 46 [2] Acts xxviii. 17.

before his time. His own work was built upon them, and he nowhere betrays any consciousness of a difference between his faith and that of the Christians at Jerusalem, except in regard to the inclusion of Gentiles in the Church. Any novelties of thought or practice would certainly have been seized upon and denounced by those, and they were not a few, who were anxious to discredit him.

The influence of Judaism may be considered under three heads. First, in regard to monotheism. In the Græco-Roman world strict monotheism was a hindrance rather than a help to the spread of the Church, for only in philosophic circles was the unity of God maintained, and even there concession was generally made to the popular belief in gods many and lords many. It would have been a simple matter to put Jesus, as "lord," on a level with the deities of pagan worship. That this was not done is evidence of the strong monotheistic influence of Judaism, which persisted in spite of the difficulty of reconciling the unity of God with the worship of Jesus.

Secondly, Christianity stressed the connexion of religion with a high morality. The New Testament teaching that purity, self-sacrifice, honesty, humility and other virtues are necessary accompaniments of Christian discipleship, is a Jewish trait. No such inevitable connexion was admitted elsewhere, as we can gather from the troubles in the Church at Corinth[1] and from the non-moral character of the mystery religions.

Thirdly, the very organisation of Christianity into a universal Church is due to Judaism. It has been

[1] 1 Cor. v. 1; xi. 20 ff.

argued that the mystery brotherhoods formed models for the local churches. This may be partly true, although the Jewish synagogue is a more obvious influence. But a world-wide society, knit together not only by a common faith, worship and order, but also by intercommunication through letters and hospitality, was a new thing outside Judaism. No votary of Isis in Egypt felt himself of necessity a brother of his fellow-votary in Rome. The Church claimed to have taken over the mission and privileges of the Jewish people. This accounts for such phrases as "a new race" or "the true Israel," and also for much of the persecution which Christianity suffered; for what the Roman Empire dreaded was the growth within it of a new society, almost a new nation, with a consciousness of its own.

In all these respects Christianity appears as a deepening and expansion of Judaism. This character was the more firmly impressed upon it by the fact that it used the Old Testament, though in its Greek form, and that the earliest records of the teaching of Jesus and the Acts of the Apostles were in Aramaic.

II

Greece.—The greater part of the Church, as it spread beyond the borders of Palestine, adopted the Greek language. This was a necessity, for Greek was a language understood by the classes of people to whom the Church first appealed, dispersed Jews, merchants, artisans and slaves. It was moreover widely current, from Egypt and Syria to Rome itself and even beyond. The result was that all the

early Aramaic records were either translated into Greek or taken up into some larger Greek work, so that none has survived in its original form. The New Testament which we possess is a body of Greek writings, even in the parts most Jewish in tone, such as the Gospel of St Matthew, the early chapters of Acts, or the Epistle of St James.

This use of Greek brought Christianity into close touch with a new world of thought. Greek was the language of a speculative philosophy older than Plato, and of a more practical philosophy taught by the Stoics and Cynics and Epicureans in St Paul's day. It was also the language of numerous mystery cults, which did their best to satisfy the cravings of religious souls for God and immortality. The influx of Greek words and ideas could not be without effect on Christian thought. Philosophy provided a means by which Christianity could be presented in rational form to the pagan world. St Paul makes little use of it; the need was not then urgent. But in the prologue of the Fourth Gospel we witness a clear effort to express Christian teaching about Jesus in philosophic terms. It is true that even here the immediate source is Jewish and not Greek, namely, the Palestinian doctrine of the Wisdom of God based on Prov. viii. 22 ff. and the writings of Philo, an Alexandrian Jew of the early first century. But the use of the term Logos (Word, Reason or Thought) shows a desire to present Christianity in terms familiar to educated Greek people. This was the beginning of a long process, which culminated in the shaping of what we call the Nicene Creed, in the great Councils of the fourth and fifth centuries.

The effect of the mystery cults on Christianity has been much disputed. Some have professed to find in them the origin of the Christian sacraments and sacramental doctrine. Certainly sacred meals and washings formed part of some mysteries, though not necessarily of all. But most of our knowledge of these cults comes from writings considerably later in date than the New Testament, and is therefore a precarious basis for a charge of Christian borrowing. There are unquestionably similarities of language, such terms as salvation, regeneration, light, glory, spirit, knowledge, being of common occurrence in the mystery writings. But whereas in the New Testament, and particularly in St Paul, these terms have always a moral significance, in the mystery cults, although we cannot say that the moral element is entirely lacking, initiation seems to promise some kind of physical change worked by magical means. Possibly in the second and following centuries, when St Paul's teaching had almost dropped out of sight, these terms did lose some of the high moral and spiritual meaning with which he had endowed them, and to this extent we may acknowledge the influence of mystery theology on the Church.

III

Rome.—The outstanding service of the Roman Empire to early Christianity was its gift of world peace. Apart from frontier struggles in Parthia and on the Danube, and the Jewish rebellions, the first two centuries were a time of peace. Wise communities cheerfully accepted the sway of Rome,

even at the cost of heavy taxation, because it gave them law, order and security. The words of Tertullus to Felix accurately describe the feelings of the various subject-peoples towards the Emperor and his officers.[1] It was such feelings, of gratitude mingled with awe, which led to the deification and worship of the Emperor in the East, and so indirectly to the persecution of Christians. But severe as the persecutions were, they were more than counterbalanced by the atmosphere of busy and contented life, without violent interruptions or disturbances, which gave the Church breathing-space and the chance of growing to self-consciousness.

BOOKS

The New Testament.

Peake's *Commentary on the Bible*. Articles: "Roman Empire in the First Century," p. 612. "Contemporary Jewish Religion," p. 618. "Pagan Religion at the Coming of Christianity," p. 627. Jack. 12s. 6d.

[1] Acts xxiv. 2, 3.

CHAPTER II

THE AGE OF THE GOSPELS

I

The Eye-witnesses.—For some thirty years after the Ascension there lived men and women who had been with Jesus in his earthly life. All knowledge of what the Master said and did must have come from these eye-witnesses. Their position in the Church was therefore one of importance and honour, and when the place of Judas became vacant it was filled by one of them.[1] They appear to have settled in Jerusalem (for we hear of no Galilean Church), and while the more prominent made small missionary journeys into the villages of Judaea and Samaria, no plans were formed for any wide extension of their message. We have no information about the later activities of these disciples, either the Twelve or their contemporaries, with the exception of St Peter and St John, with St James the son of Zebedee and the other James called the Lord's brother. While they were alive and accessible, however, they must have been appealed to constantly for knowledge about Jesus. The document called Q by scholars, which is incorporated into St Matthew and St Luke, was perhaps the work of one of them, and we learn from St Luke's

[1] Acts i. 21.

preface that many such works were written by those who had heard the eye-witnesses.[1] As death gradually reduced their number, it became important to preserve their testimony. Of the four eye-witnesses whose movements we can partly trace, James the Apostle was killed by Herod Agrippa in A.D. 44, James the Lord's brother, after presiding over the Church of Jerusalem, was put to death about the year A.D. 62 by the Jews, and St Peter in all probability suffered martyrdom at Rome in the persecution under Nero about A.D. 64. If the John who lived at Ephesus until nearly the close of the first century, and was the author of, or authority for, the Fourth Gospel, is the son of Zebedee, he is the solitary instance of an eye-witness who survived so long. But it is almost certain that there has been confusion between the original disciple and a later John.

II

The Destruction of Jerusalem.—In the year A.D. 70, after a terrible siege of nearly five months, the city of Jerusalem was captured by Titus, son of Vespasian the newly-made Emperor. City and Temple alike were destroyed. Before the siege began the Jewish Christians, being out of sympathy with the rebellion, withdrew to Pella, a small village on the eastern side of Jordan. Thus the Jewish Church survived, and maintained an uneventful history for another century, but it ceased to play any effective part in the spread of Christianity.

The destruction of Jerusalem cuts a deep chasm

[1] Luke i. 2.

across the history of the Church. Many of the scenes, personages and problems familiar to us from the Gospels, such as temple and sacrifices, priests and Sadducees, feasts and pilgrims, Pharisees with their meticulous observance of the law, Sanhedrin, relations between Roman and Jew or between Jew and Gentile, either vanish as in a moment or become of no interest to the Church. In view of this, the fact that the Gospels do picture, so surely and vividly, the surroundings of the earlier time, is a conclusive proof that their origins, though not the works in their present form, go back to days when the city and temple were still standing.

With Jerusalem in ruins and its Christian survivors scattered, the Church was loosed from its ancient moorings and set free to take an independent course in the Gentile world. This was a great gain. A Jerusalem that remained Jewish would inevitably have tended to localise Christian devotion and obscure the spiritual and universal character of the Gospel message. Henceforth Antioch, Ephesus, Alexandria, and above all Rome, became the main centres of Christianity. When after the second Jewish rebellion in 135 under the pretended Messiah Bar-Cochba, Jerusalem was re-established with the pagan name of Aelia, it was wholly a Gentile city, no Jew being permitted to enter it; and the bishops of the revived Church were Gentiles.

III

The Writing of the Gospels.—The passing of eye-witnesses, and the disappearance of Jerusalem as the central home of the Church, brings us to a period

of which very little is known. It has been said that about A.D. 70 the Church enters into a tunnel, from which it does not emerge till the second decade of the second century. Great changes occur in this interval. There is rapid expansion for one thing. Even more important is the gradual fixation of Church organisation and custom. In St Paul's time there is a certain fluidity, for example, about the ministry. Bishops and presbyters (or elders) are identical,[1] and there are numerous other ministers of a somewhat informal sort, owing their ministry to personal gifts and not Church appointment.[2] At the close of the period in question there is, in most places, one bishop in control of a city Church, and the informal ministries are disappearing. In the Eucharist there is a change from the free prayer of the presiding minister to something approaching an ordered liturgy. By what stages and under what conditions these changes took place we cannot tell, for practically no literature remains. Either much has disappeared, or the Church's energy was exhausted in the production of her supreme literary achievement, the Four Gospels. For it is to this period that these belong.

Of the four, the Gospel of St Mark is, by common consent of almost all modern scholars, the earliest. Its actual date still remains doubtful, but it is about the year 70, a little earlier if chapter xiii. does not reflect the fall of Jerusalem and a little later if it does. The place of origin is probably Rome. The interest of this Gospel centres in its portrait of Jesus, who is depicted in a lifelike and frankly human way,

[1] Acts xx. 17, 28 ; Titus i. 5, 7.
[2] 1 Cor. xii. 28.

yet as possessing marvellous powers over nature and men. No mention is made of his pre-existence, though this had been widely taught by St Paul many years before. Nor are the birth and infancy noticed. The "good news" begins with the baptism of Jesus by St John. He is thenceforward the "Son of God" and at the same time the Messiah, although this fact is known only to his disciples; when revealed at the trial it leads to his immediate condemnation. Unfortunately the original ending of the Gospel was early lost, and we have only the news of the women finding the tomb empty on the third morning after the Crucifixion and receiving a message that the Master had risen.

It would seem as if the value of St Mark's Gospel was not fully realised by the Church; otherwise many copies would quickly have been made and the lost ending would have survived somewhere. But our shortened copy was used by the authors of St Matthew and St Luke, both of whom combined it with other material they possessed, particularly with an account of some of the words and acts of Jesus which scholars now call Q. Beyond such additions and certain rearrangements, these Gospels make a new departure in tracing the history of Jesus from his birth. Their purpose is to show that the character and work of Jesus do not depend upon his baptism by John, but go right back to his birth under the special providence of God. St Matthew is of Palestinian origin and somewhat Judaic in tone; its date is perhaps from A.D. 80 to 90. St Luke was written for Gentile Christians, possibly at Antioch, and its date, which depends upon the date of the companion work Acts, has been variously placed

between A.D. 60 and 100. For purposes of Church History, however, the precise date is in neither case of great importance.

The Gospel of St John presents fresh characteristics. St Mark is no longer used as a basis, though it was well known to the writer. A selection of incidents is made, some from the other Gospels, some new, and these serve as illustrations for special teaching about the person and work of Jesus. The keynote is found in the prologue, in which St Paul's teaching of the pre-existence of Jesus is developed into the doctrine of the Logos or Word of God, who became incarnate in Jesus, in order that all who believe on him might receive the divine life and become sons of God. This doctrine had the merit of combining Jewish and Greek thought and relating both to the person of Jesus. It gradually displaced previous conceptions, though not without a struggle, and became the groundwork of Christian theology. The date of this Gospel is between A.D. 95 and 110.

BOOKS

D. Bruce Walker: *A Study of the New Testament.* S.C.M. 2s. 6d.

Lonsdale Ragg: *The Church of the Apostles.*

CHAPTER III

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS

I

Clement, Ignatius and Polycarp.—As we emerge from the dark period in which the Gospels were written, we meet with a number of writings conveniently classed together under the title, Apostolic Fathers. They are the first Church writings after those which, like Gospels and Epistles, were by reason of their reputed Apostolic authority placed in the Canon of the New Testament. The earliest, called the *Epistle of Clement*, is a first-century work, dating from about A.D. 95. The others are of varying dates, probably all within the first half of the second century. These works, though differing much in worth and interest, yet give us a valuable picture of Church life and teaching.

The *Epistle of Clement* is a letter written in the name of the Church of Rome and carried by three of its members to the Church of Corinth. No single bishop is mentioned as ruling in either Church, but from early times Clement is universally named as the writer (for the Epistle became famous, and was read in many Churches until the fourth century at least) and he was clearly the leader at Rome in his day. At Corinth "one or two persons" had started a schism, driving "the presbyters" from

their position, perhaps in order to set others in their place, or more likely (since the Epistle mentions no others) to re-establish the vanishing ministry of spiritual gifts. No doctrinal quarrel is suggested. The Corinthians are exhorted to humility and obedience, by the help of illustrations freely drawn from the Old Testament. St Peter and St Paul are mentioned together as men " of our own generation," who suffered for the faith, and St Paul's Epistles are quoted, especially 1 Corinthians. Whether the letter is spontaneous or the answer to an appeal, its confident and authoritative tone is noticeable. The writer has been identified with the Clement of Phil. iv. 3, and with Flavius Clemens, a kinsman of Domitian, who was put to death by the latter for becoming a Christian. These are, however, unlikely guesses.

The so-called second Epistle of Clement is really a homily, of much later date, which has somehow become attached to the genuine Epistle.

In some ways akin to Clement are the seven Epistles of Ignatius. Eusebius [1] tells us that he was the third Bishop of Antioch in Syria, St Peter being reckoned the first, and was condemned to be killed by wild beasts at Rome. Journeying overland to Rome under military guard, he was allowed to be visited by representatives of the Churches on the way; and he writes five letters, in the first place of thanks for kindness received, to these Churches, namely, Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Philadelphia and Smyrna, together with one to the Church of Rome and a personal one to Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna. The letters to Asia Minor are

[1] *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 36.

remarkable for the fact that, like 1 *Clement*, their chief interest is in Church government. Ignatius lays the greatest stress on the duty of obedience to the bishop. A single, ruling bishop is meant, and in most cases his name is given. Under him is a body of presbyters, and in the third rank a body of deacons. The bishops stand in the place of God or Jesus Christ, the presbyters are as "the council of God and the college of Apostles," the deacons are the servants, not of men, but of Christ.[1] Each order must be honoured in its degree, but the bishop is supreme. Apart from him is no Church, no valid Eucharist.[2] He who does anything without the bishop's knowledge is serving the devil.[3] The change from a loose to a closely-knit organisation was no doubt necessary, in view of the perils, doctrinal and political, which faced the growing Church. But Ignatius' language indicates that it was not accomplished without difficulty.

Another point of interest in the letters is Ignatius' protest against Docetism, the heresy which regarded our Lord's sufferings, and sometimes his whole life, as merely an appearance. Here he follows the teaching of 1 John iv. 2, 3, and his doctrine of Christ also follows on the lines of the Johannine writings, which are of Ephesian origin. In the letter to Ephesus, however, he makes no reference at all to the famous John, whether Apostle or Presbyter, who had died there only some fifteen or twenty years before.

The letter to Rome has a different purpose from

[1] Magnesians, vi.
[2] Trallians, iii.; Ephes. v.; Smyrnæans, viii
[3] Smyrnæans, ix.

the rest. Ignatius feels that the influence of the Roman Church will be used to prevent his martyrdom. He begs that they will let him die. "Suffer me to be an imitator of the passion of my God." There is little doubt but that his request was granted, and that he became a martyr about A.D. 115, in the closing years of Trajan's reign.

The *Epistle of Polycarp*, the before-mentioned Bishop of Smyrna, to the Philippian Church, is a covering letter for the collection of the Ignatian Epistles, which were evidently widely circulated and treasured. We possess also an account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, which took place at Smyrna about A.D. 155.

II

The Didache and Barnabas.—The *Didache*, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, is a composite work. The first part is a tract on The Two Ways, of Life and Death, used for the instruction of converts, and of Jewish or early Christian origin. Then follows a series of instructions on Church rites and customs. We have directions how to baptize, in running water if possible; if not, in still water or by affusion, with the use in all cases of the Threefold Name. Fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays is enjoined, and the saying of the Lord's Prayer three times a day. A form is given for the consecration of the Cup and the Bread (in this order) in the Eucharist, and a prayer of thanksgiving to follow. The "prophets," however, are not to be bound to these formal prayers. These prophets are clearly a recognised part of the Church ministry

in the places where the *Didache* was received, and directions are given for their hospitable reception, together with other travelling ministers, such as "teachers" and "apostles." Tests are given by which genuine prophets may be distinguished from false. If a prophet, speaking in the Spirit, asks for food or money, or if he stays more than two or three days in one place, or wishes to remain permanently without working for his living, he is to be rejected. The fixed, local ministry is, however, also recognised. "Appoint therefore for yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, meek men, and not lovers of money, and truthful and approved, for they also minister to you the ministry of the prophets and teachers." [1]

The date of the *Didache* as we have it is uncertain, but probably not later than A.D. 150. The *Two Ways* is much earlier. Another version of this latter tract is found at the end of an anonymous work traditionally called the *Epistle of Barnabas*, dating from the early years of the second century, or even before. The object of this Epistle is to warn its readers against a Judaistic interpretation of the Old Testament. It was natural that when the Old Testament was read to converts and treated as an inspired book, they should wonder why so many things in it, *e.g.*, the laws relating to the temple and sacrifices, clean and unclean foods, circumcision, etc., were disregarded by the Church. Barnabas freely allegorises the Old Testament in order to solve the difficulty.

[1] *Didache*, xv.

III

Hermas.—The Shepherd of Hermas stands in a class by itself. It is a record of visions seen by one Hermas, whose brother Pius was Bishop of Rome in A.D. 148. But as it mentions Clement,[1] who is directed to send copies of the work to foreign cities, its date is probably quite early in the second century, assuming that Clement is the well-known Roman Bishop. *The Shepherd* has been compared to the *Pilgrim's Progress*, and there are many similarities between the two, though the latter is immeasurably superior in imaginative power. Hermas has been a slave, but at the time of writing he is a free man of mature years, married, and with grown children. His domestic affairs were not of the happiest, and one day, meeting again his former mistress, he indulges a passing wish that he had a wife as handsome and good as she. Soon after she appears to him in a vision and reproaches him for this sinful thought. He then learns that this is not the main accusation against him; his children also are ill brought up, and need warning and correction, so that they may repent. Meanwhile the mistress disappears from the scene, and her place is taken by an old woman who symbolises the Church. The charge now shifts from Hermas and his children to the members of the Church generally, who are guilty of laxity and worldliness. Hermas is bidden say that, contrary to the rigorous Church teaching which gave no hope of pardon for sins committed

[1] *Visions*, ii. 4.

after baptism, there is an opportunity of repentance open to such as will accept it now. But there are limits to this concession; it will be granted only to those who were Christians when Hermas wrote, not to future converts.

The rest of the book centres round this question of repentance, which is illustrated by a series of Visions, followed by Twelve Commandments and Ten Similitudes or allegories. After the Visions the Church in her turn disappears, and is succeeded by the Shepherd, who gives his name to the book. He is the "Angel of Repentance," who has charge of Christians. Under varied symbols of trees and mountains, stones and towers, he explains to Hermas the truth about the conduct and destiny of members of the Church. The imagery is often fantastic, but the moral teaching is on the whole sound and sensible; and although learned men like Jerome might scorn the book, it must have been greatly appreciated by humbler Christians, for it was widely read in Churches for several centuries as an inspired work.

Except for the one vague reference to Clement, Hermas always speaks of the ministry in the plural, "presbyters," "bishops," or "those who preside over the Church." Perhaps we are at the stage when, in Rome, a ruler is just emerging from the college of presbyters. The ministry of prophets still exists, for Hermas, like the *Didache*, gives directions for the discerning of true and false ones. Possibly Hermas was himself a prophet. His theology is defective; he regards Jesus as a man (in his own word, "flesh"), who for a blameless life was united for ever "as a partner" with the

pre-existent Spirit or Son of God.[1] In this, however, he probably represents the views of most Roman Christians of his own days.

BOOKS

Kirsopp Lake: *The Apostolic Fathers.* Text and translation in the Loeb Classical Library. Heinemann. 2 vols. at 10s.

Ante-Nicene Christian Library. Vol. "The Apostolic Fathers."

H. Scott Holland: *The Apostolic Fathers.* S.P.C.K.

[1] v. 6.

CHAPTER IV

PERSECUTION AND THE APOLOGISTS

I

Persecutions to A.D. 180.—From the first the profession of Christianity was dangerous. Examples of intermittent persecution occur in the New Testament, *e.g.*, the murder of St Stephen,[1] the execution of St James by Herod Agrippa,[2] and the many attacks on St Paul. These were due to Jewish enmity, and the Roman power was regarded by St Paul as a protection. Gradually this protection gave place to an enmity greater even than that of the Jews, asserted at first occasionally and almost by chance, and then systematically and deliberately. After the great fire at Rome in July 64, Nero, who was suspected of causing it, sought to recover the favour of the populace by throwing the blame on the Christians, who were disliked for their strict notions about pagan amusements and morality. Some were arrested, and when examined under torture gave the names of others, so that a large number were brought to trial. What the charge was on which they were convicted is not clear; that of arson seems to have been dropped, and reliance placed on the Christians' "hatred of mankind." It is probable that before this persecution, local as

[1] Acts vii. 58. [2] Acts xii. 1.

it was, has ceased, it had become an acknowledged fact in the courts that the profession of Christianity was itself a crime, apart from any wrong-doing. This was certainly the case when 1 Peter was written, perhaps about A.D. 80.[1]

The persecution was carried through with horrible barbarity.[2] It must have been at this time that St Peter and St Paul suffered at Rome. Henceforth in Christian eyes Rome is Babylon, drunk with the blood of saints, and Nero is the beast and Antichrist. After a short break, persecution was resumed under Domitian (81-96). His motives were personal; a desire to remove any who were dangerous or obnoxious to himself. In Rome some prominent Christians suffered under his mad tyranny, notably Flavius Clemens, Domitian's cousin and colleague in the consulship, who was executed for "atheism," "Jewish practices," and "contemptible inactivity," doubtless a pagan description of Christianity.[3] Domitilla, the wife of Clemens, was banished. On the other hand, when the grandsons of Jude, the Lord's brother, were brought before Domitian, as possible claimants for the kingdom, he dismissed them contemptuously, seeing them to be simple peasants. Yet his persecution was more than local, if as is generally thought the exile of St John in Patmos and the death of Antipas at Pergamum[4] occurred at this time. But these were religious, not political, in motive, arising out of Emperor-worship, which was popular in Asia Minor and

[1] See 1 Peter iv. 16.
[2] Tacitus, *Ann.*, xv. xliv.
[3] *Dio Cassius*, lxvii., 14, 2; Suetonius, *Vita Domit.*, xv. 1.
[4] Rev. ii. 13.

pleasing to Domitian, who allowed himself to be addressed as "Our Lord and God."

In the reign of Trajan (98-117) the younger Pliny, then governor of Bithynia, writes to the Emperor for advice on account of the number of Christians brought to his notice by informers. The reply is that Christians need not be sought out, and anonymous accusations against them may be disregarded. But where a proper charge is preferred, and no denial or recantation made, they must be punished. Pliny has previously admitted that his inquiries have produced no evidence of any moral fault in Christians. They are punishable, clearly, for the Name alone.

Hadrian (117-138) and Antoninus Pius (138-161) continued Trajan's policy, but with further checks on informers, who were to be punished if they failed to substantiate their charges. This gave Christians some measure of security, yet they are still, in the eyes of the law, criminals, and at the mercy of a hostile judge, or a mob, or a bold informer. If rulers discourage persecution, as these undoubtedly do, it is from the desire to disturb the public peace as little as possible.

Marcus Aurelius (161-180), the good Stoic Emperor, adopted a more vigorous method. The brutal persecution at Lyons and Vienne in 177 was sanctioned by him. At Rome Justin Martyr and others were put to death about 163; in Asia Minor Polycarp suffered about the same time; at Pergamum, Carpus and Papylus were burnt; and there were also, in 180, severe persecutions at Scillium and Madaura in Numidia. Commodus, the worthless son of Marcus, allowed the persecutions to cease, partly

out of regard for the wishes of his mistress Marcia, who was, or had been, a Christian.

II

Causes of Persecutions.—All these persecutions were temporary. There were many times and places where quiet reigned. The growth of Church organisation and the development of thought, revealed by the considerable literature that has come down to us, show that persecution, though always imminent, was in fact the exception and not the rule. The number of martyrs in the second century would not be great in comparison with the total number of Christians. The Empire had no thought-out policy with regard to the Church until the general persecutions of the third century, beginning with that of Decius in 250. These were systematic attempts, not to punish or frighten a few people, but to exterminate the religion itself.

How can we account for the hostility to Christians which continually aroused the spirit of persecution? First, they were regarded as atheists for their rejection of the popular gods and their images. Jews, too, would fall under this charge, but they were older than Christians and better understood; besides, their religion at least allowed for a temple and sacrifices. Jews had, moreover, obtained privileges from the Empire and, apart from the fanatical element in Judaea, had always proved themselves loyal citizens. The destruction of Jerusalem seems to have made no difference whatever to the status of Jews elsewhere. Jews, too, were an alien race

and kept much to themselves. Though adherents or sympathisers were not inconsiderable, the number of definite proselytes could scarcely have been large. Christianity, however, took its members from pagan homes and made them at once despise their ancestral religion and customs. Perhaps the converts were not always wise, or even kind, in their denunciations. At any rate, to the common man, they seemed to be without gods, and atheists are never popular.

A more serious charge was want of patriotism. Christians, with the end of the world in view, seemed indifferent to the prosperity of the Empire. True, the expectation of a speedy end died down in the second century, and Christians at all times protested that they prayed for the Emperor and his government and obeyed all lawful commands. Yet there was unquestionably a tendency to shrink from public offices, which often involved religious ceremonies objectionable to Christians. Tertullian says indeed: "We are of yesterday, and yet we have filled everything that is yours, your cities, islands, fortresses, towns, assemblies, your very camps, tribes, regiments, palace, senate, forum; we have left to you nothing but the temples." [1] However true this may have been, we cannot help observing in many Christian writings a certain aloofness from the common life, even a contempt for it. The refusal to worship the Emperor's statue was felt to be proof of an unpatriotic mind. Legally it was treason, and punishable by death. For the Roman citizen the ceremony was a simple act of homage, so plainly political in character that he could not

[1] *Apologeticus*, 37.

understand why it should be objected to, except by those who cared nothing for the Empire.

Lastly, there was the charge of immorality. A secret society with secret meetings in which there was talk of love, sacrifice, body and blood, gave rise to horrible rumours which recur so often that we must suppose some people believed them. No such charges were ever proved, nor did they form the direct reason for any persecution, but they helped to inflame popular passion and to create an atmosphere of ill-will which told heavily against the Church.

III

Christian Answers to Persecution.—Persecution called forth a number of Apologies, *i.e.*, reasoned defences of Christianity. These show that converts were often intellectual men. At Athens, Quadratus is said to have presented an Apology to Hadrian on his visit to the city in 125; but only fragments remain. Aristides, a philosopher of Athens, addressed an Apology to Antoninus Pius in 140. After explaining how the Christian idea of God differs from that of Greeks and barbarians, he ends with a fine description of Christian character. "I have no doubt," he says, "that the world stands by reason of the intercession of Christians. But the rest of the peoples . . . grope as if in the dark, because they are unwilling to know the truth." Tatian, who composed a *Diatessaron*, or Harmony of the Four Gospels, wrote also an *Address to the Greeks*, about 152. He deserts the high level of Aristides for a scornful description of pagan mythology.

Melito, Bishop of Sardis about 170, addressed an Apology to Marcus Aurelius, from whom, on account of his high character, Christians hoped much, but in vain. This has not survived, but there is still extant a *Plea for the Christians*, written by Athenagoras, another philosopher of Athens, in 177. This is an able and temperate defence of Christians from the charges of atheism and immorality. Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, writes to a pagan friend Autolycus, about 180, not only showing the folly of idolatry, but also arguing at length from the Old Testament in support of Christian teaching.

The most important of the second-century Apologists, and typical of them all, is Justin Martyr. Born at Shechem in Samaria early in the second century, he became a student of philosophy, and favoured in turn the doctrines of Stoicism, Aristotelianism, Pythagoreanism and Platonism. Then at Ephesus, where he had settled, he met one who told him that the Hebrew prophets were older than the Greek philosophers. He read the Old Testament, therefore, noting specially the passages which were said to foretell the coming of Christ. Here he found the true philosophy. As a result he wrote, in 153, his Apology, addressed to Antoninus Pius and his sons. Later on he wrote also the *Dialogue with Trypho*, a liberal-minded Jew, in which the questions at issue between Christianity and Judaism are exhaustively discussed. Justin went to Rome, and was there denounced as a Christian by a fellow-philosopher, Crescens, and put to death.

Justin's *Apology* follows the normal course in maintaining that Christians are neither atheists nor guilty of crimes. It also contains, however, a

valuable description of Baptism and the Eucharist, written, no doubt, with the object of removing pagan suspicions. Of the latter he tells us that it was celebrated on Sunday, when the Christian brethren met together and the memoirs of the Apostles or the writings of the prophets were read. Then followed a sermon by the presiding minister, based on the reading. After prayer had been offered, bread and a cup of wine and water were brought in and a thanksgiving said over them by the president, to which the congregation answered, Amen. The food thus blessed was then distributed to those present and a portion sent through the deacons to the absent brethren. A collection of money was also made for the sick and poor and those in prison. The bread and wine, to which the name Eucharist was given, were not, Justin says, regarded as common food, but as the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, according to his own words preserved in "the memoirs of the Apostles, which are called Gospels." [1] This account, written in untechnical language for pagan readers, throws a vivid light on Christian worship in the middle of the second century.

In Justin's theology, as in that of the other Apologists, Christianity is conceived in Greek fashion as the true and final philosophy. As related to Judaism it is the New Law, mediated through Christ the Logos or Reason of God. Its teaching consists in a knowledge of the true God, as contrasted with polytheism and idolatry; in a lofty morality; and in the assurance of immortality to believers. We miss St Paul's passionate insistence on the mystical union of the believer with Christ, the

[1] Justin, 1 *Apol.*, 65, 67.

sense of forgiveness, and the supersession of the law by the indwelling Spirit. What is gained is a union of Greek thought with Christianity, which prepared the way for a scientific theology. A point of importance is the stress laid on the Old Testament. Long calculations are made to prove that Moses is earlier than the Greek philosophers. This seemed necessary in order to give Christianity a history, to root it deeply in the past. But in thus taking over the Old Testament the Church was forced to explain why it differed so often from Christian standards; and the idea of development being unknown, recourse was had to allegorical interpretation,[1] and the real meaning of the Old Testament was obscured almost until to-day. No doubt the Church needed the Old Testament, but its adoption under second-century conditions had grave disadvantages. It lowered Christian morality by substituting law for the Spirit. It encumbered Christianity with beliefs essentially foreign to it, *e.g.*, creation in seven days, and the Sabbath. It caused the human Christ of the Gospels to be misunderstood or forgotten, thus taking away from the Incarnation much of its value. And it distorted the character of God, bringing in Old Testament ideas of a deity of stern justice and vengeance in place of the loving Father of Jesus.

BOOKS

H. B. Workman: *Persecution in the Early Church*. Epworth Press. 3s. 6d.

W. M. Ramsay: *The Church in the Roman Empire before* A.D. 170. Hodder. 15s.

Ante-Nicene Christian Library. Vols.: "Justin Martyr and Athenagoras," "Tertullian," etc.

[1] See p. 23.

CHAPTER V

GNOSTICISM

I

General Ideas of Gnosticism.—Persecution was the danger which threatened Christianity from the State. We now turn to the more serious danger from alien religious ideas. In the first and second centuries a wave of thought swept over the Roman world, whose watchword was *gnosis*, knowledge. It came from the East, and was associated with the doctrine that the material world, because it changes and decays, is essentially evil. There is, however, an incorruptible world above the fixed stars, which with their pure light and ordered movement were thought to be the nearest approach to the divine abode. To this world some men might attain, being saved from the world of matter, if only they learned the true *gnosis*. Such were "spiritual" men, who had within them a spark of the divine life, which belonged rightly to the divine world. Others were psychic or "natural" men, and hopelessly embedded in matter. *Gnosis* was not intellectual knowledge, but the possession of certain magical names and formulas which would enable the spiritual man to pass at death through the planetary spheres, whose angelic rulers would oppose their upward journey, and finally reach God. This was the Gnostic "salvation," open to a few only.

Such a system, though alien to Christianity, could find much in Christian teaching, and especially in St Paul's writings, that was adaptable to its own purposes. The distinction of "spiritual" and "natural" men, which in St Paul[1] is a moral one, changeable by a change of will, is in Gnosticism fixed and essential. The "world-rulers of this darkness,"[2] demonic spiritual forces against whom the Christian has to struggle in this life, become real deities, having the control of the material world, one of them being its actual Creator.

On the theological side, Gnosticism was an attempt to solve an age-long human difficulty by explaining how an imperfect world could have come from a perfect God. Its method was to imagine a descent by numerous stages, which it was hoped would remove the original Deity from connexion with or responsibility for the final result of the process. First comes the Abyss, or Silence or Ineffable—various expressions are used to designate the great Unknowable origin of things. Around this gathers a Pleroma,[3] or Divine Completeness, consisting of attributes of the Deity personified as spiritual beings called Æons. These are not created, nor begotten, but "emanate" from the primal Deity, the products as it were of an excess of life and power. They are in groups, an Ogdoad, or group of eight, coming first. The entire Pleroma is independent of matter or a material universe. This comes into existence only when one of the Æons, low down in the scale, called Sophia or Wisdom, is seized with a

[1] See 1 Cor. ii. 14, 15; iii. 1-3. [2] Eph. vi. 12.

[3] This word, too, is used by St Paul in Col i. 19; ii. 9, but with an emphatic reference to Christ alone.

strong passion to comprehend the Unknowable, which leads to her fall from the Pleroma and to the appearance, as the fruit of her passion, of Formless Matter. After this Sophia gives birth to a son, the Demiurge or Creator, who fashions the universe out of matter. This Demiurge is unconscious of any power above him, and imagines himself to be the Supreme God, but in reality he is controlled by his mother Sophia, the result being a difference in the souls he creates, some containing a spark of spiritual life, others belonging wholly to the sphere of matter. To rescue these spiritual souls is the function of Christ, or the Saviour, one of the Æons, who comes to Jesus generally at His Baptism and departs just before the Crucifixion. Jesus leaves with His disciples, in a secret tradition, the *gnosis* by which these souls may return to their true home.

II

The Gnostic Sects.—The above is a general description, but it must be remembered that there was a bewildering variety of Gnostic sects and systems. Assyrian, Persian, Egyptian, Jewish and Greek ideas are mingled together, often in fantastic confusion. Some Gnosticism is pre-Christian. Other varieties are hinted at in the New Testament, as in the "profane babblings and oppositions of the knowledge which is falsely so called," of 1 Tim. vi. 20. In Acts[1] we are told of Simon Magus, who seems to have given himself out to be an incarnation of the

[1] Acts viii. 9-24.

Unknowable, and his companion Helena (not mentioned in Acts) as the *Ennoia* or Thought of God. The account in Acts points to an attempt to ally his system with the growing power of Christianity. Other first-century Gnostic teachers are Menander, a Samaritan like Simon; and Cerinthus, who taught at Ephesus about the end of the century that Jesus was a man indwelt by the Heavenly Saviour.

It was in the middle of the second century that Gnosticism flourished most. There were many sects which can be conveniently classed together under the name Ophites, from *ophis*, a serpent. As the Creator revealed in the Old Testament is not the Supreme God, it was argued that the serpent who opposed him should be honoured, and this idea fitted in with the story of the brazen serpent and with serpent-worship in general, a widespread ancient cult. The Cainites applied this principle further, and honoured Cain, Esau, Korah and even Judas.

Other sects take their name from some conspicuous teacher. Satornilus of Antioch, the disciple of Menander, taught that the world was created by seven inferior angels, *i.e.* the seven rulers of the planetary spheres, the God of the Jews being chief of these. The Supreme God, in pity for man, bestowed upon him a divine spark, and the Saviour descended to rescue man, thus endowed, from the oppressive rule of the angels. Jesus was himself a man only in appearance.

The two greatest Gnostic teachers were Basilides and Valentinus. Of Basilides' doctrine we have contradictory accounts in Irenæus and Hippolytus. It seems, however, that he abandoned the ordinary

theory of Æons and Emanation, and held that the Non-existent (for such is the daring term he uses in order to avoid seeming to describe the Unknowable) created a primeval seed, in which were latent all possible levels of life, to unfold as by a process of evolution. There results an Ogdoad (in this case separated from the Non-existent by the Firmament, identified with the Holy Spirit) and a Hebdomad (*i.e.* the planetary spheres) each ruled by an Archon unconscious of any existence above his own. In the seed were also three Sonships, or parts of the divine life, the third of which lies in this world unable to extricate itself. The Gospel, according to Basilides, consists in the Ogdoad catching the light from the Spirit, and the Hebdomad from the Ogdoad, so that each learns with amazement of the powers above him. The light spreads from the Hebdomad to earth through Jesus, whose death releases the Sonship within him so that it can fly back to the Non-existent God. When all the other Sonship on earth has followed Him, then God will spread over all creation from the Ogdoad downwards the Great Ignorance, by which none is aware of anything above himself; and so all striving, and with it all sorrow, will come to an end.

To us few things could seem more bizarre than this system. Yet it is clearly an attempt to penetrate the mystery of existence, and as such deserves respect. We notice that the evolutionary process is upward, not downward, and that no principle of evil is recognised. The bent of Basilides' mind can be gauged from a saying of his preserved by Clement of Alexandria: "I will affirm anything rather than call Providence evil."

The system of Valentinus, who, with Basilides, was an Alexandrian, follows the normal Gnostic course. The primeval Abyss and Silence put forth Mind and Truth, from whom proceed Thought (Logos) and Life, Man and Church. These four pairs, or "syzygies," make up the Ogdoad. Then follows a decad and a dodecad, making a Pleroma of thirty in all. Thus the divine power is conceived as continually extending its activities downward, each pair being of necessity less perfect than its predecessor. The material universe is accounted for by the passion and fall of Sophia, already described. In the redemption effected by Jesus Valentinus introduced a change. The "spiritual" would ascend through the spheres to the Pleroma, to be united with the angels. The "psychical" were not all abandoned, but such as were capable of exercising faith and good works by the aid of Jesus would ascend to the sphere of the fallen Sophia. Only those hopelessly bereft of spiritual nature would be left unredeemed.

III

The Peril of Gnosticism.—Many of these Gnostic teachers were members of the Church and taught in it; nor was it always recognised at once how divergent were their speculations from the teaching of Jesus and the traditional faith of the Church. But Gnosticism was a great peril. It was always, except possibly in the system of Basilides, dualistic in character, recognising in the universe an evil or material principle with which God cannot deal.

Thus it contradicted the fundamental Christian belief in one God, maker of all things visible and invisible. It also denied the Incarnation, for the true God could not come into contact with evil matter, and so Jesus was reduced to a phantom. The rejection of matter had two consequences. Sometimes it led to a severe asceticism, marriage and the eating of animal food being forbidden. In other cases the argument was used that, matter being entirely unspiritual, the spiritual man could use it as he liked. Carpocrates, an Alexandrian Gnostic, seems to have allowed, if not expressly advocated, a life of licence. His son Isidorus, who died at seventeen and was afterwards deified by the sect, wrote what Clement of Alexandria calls a "much talked of book," with the title *On Justice*, in which he advocated communism in all things, including women. With a true instinct, the Church opposed Gnosticism in all its forms. But in doing so she was forced to define more sharply than before her terms of communion and articles of faith. The Creeds, the Canon of Scripture and a rigid Church organisation were the product of this struggle.

BOOKS

Murray's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. John Murray. 25s. Articles: "Basilides," "Valentinus," "Saturninus (*i.e.*, Satornilus)," "Carpocrates" and "Gnosticism."

Edwyn Bevan: *Hellenism and Christianity*, esp. Ch. V. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

F. Legge: *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*.

T. R. Glover: *Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*. Methuen. 10s. 6d.

CHAPTER VI

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

I

Scripture, Creed and Church.—The extravagances of Gnosticism forced Christians to ask what was the true doctrine of the Church and where was it to be found. The Gnostics spoke of a tradition delivered by Jesus to one or other of the Apostles and handed down secretly. They produced books, which they called "apocryphal," that is, hidden or secret, in which this tradition was set forth. The Church rejected these books as untrue, and "apocryphal" soon came to mean spurious. The idea of making a collection of authoritative writings originated perhaps with Marcion, a teacher of Gnostic tendencies in the middle of the second century. Marcion rejected the Old Testament, and being thus left without any sacred writings he grouped together St Paul's Epistles and St Luke's Gospel, with certain omissions. These he maintained to be the sources for the Gospel teaching. In reply, the Church declared the Four Gospels to be the authorised records of the life of Jesus, and added to them both the Pauline and the Catholic Epistles, with Acts and Revelation. There were for long differences of opinion about certain books, especially Revelation, which some valued highly and others

lightly. *Hermas* and 1 *Clement* were also included at first in some places. But subject to a few such doubtful cases, the Canon of the New Testament was fixed by about 180, and the writings composing it gradually took their place by the side of the Old Testament, as equally inspired.

It was also found desirable to have a short statement which a convert might recite before baptism as an expression of faith. Originally, it would seem, baptism was "into the name of the Lord Jesus,"[1] and an early insertion in the text of Acts[2] represents a convert as declaring: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." In Justin Martyr's time the Threefold Name was used,[3] which points to an analogous declaration of faith. To the bare mention of the Three Persons was added, however, both in East and West, phrases describing the divine work and attributes, which had been used in the convert's instruction. Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra, when in exile at Rome in 336, accepted the Creed of the Roman Church and has left us a copy of it. The Creed is similar to our Apostles' Creed, with the omission of a few clauses, such as, "Maker of heaven and earth," "descended into hell," "the communion of saints" and "the life everlasting." Its use can be traced in Rome at least to the time of Tertullian (*c.* 160–240), who says that "the rule of faith is entirely one . . . namely, to believe in one God Almighty, Maker of the world, and in His Son Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, raised from the dead on the third day, received back into heaven, sitting now

[1] Acts viii. 16; xix. 5.
[2] Acts viii. 37 (R.V.)
[3] 1 *Apol.*, lxi.

at the right hand of the Father, and about to come to judge the living and the dead through the resurrection of the flesh."[1] Elsewhere Tertullian says that his own Church, the African, owed its Creed to the Church of Rome.[2] We can say, therefore, that the Roman Creed was in existence by about 150, and some would date it much earlier, even to 100. It was framed, as the New Testament was written, for Church purposes, not to refute heretics; but like the Canon of Scripture it served the latter purpose well, by providing a body of teaching, simple, concise and grounded on Apostolic authority, which could be set against the speculations of heretical teachers.

The guardians both of faith and of the Scriptures were the bishops. Since the time of Ignatius[3] the system of monarchical bishops had been gradually superseding all other forms of Church government. This ensured that a strong hand should be everywhere present to guide the Church in sound and ancient ways and to repress novel or unscriptural teaching. It also gave rise to the idea of a succession from the Apostles, by which the purity of the faith could be readily tested. About 160–180 a Jewish Christian named Hegesippus travelled widely, visiting among other places Corinth and Rome. Everywhere he was interested in the bishops and their predecessors. At Rome he made a "succession," *i.e.* apparently, a list of bishops, ending with Anicetus, Soter and Eleutherus. He notes the uniformity of doctrine: "In every succession, and in every city,

[1] Tertullian, *De virg. vel.*, 1.
[2] Idem, *De præscr. hæret.*, xxxvi.
[3] See Chapter III.

that is held which is proclaimed by the law and the prophets and the Lord."[1] So too Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons (*c.* 180) lays great stress on the succession from the Apostles, as the means by which the truth is preserved unimpaired.[2]

Thus the Catholic Church, with one Scripture, one Faith and one Episcopate, was equipped to meet the perils that confronted it. Doubtless there was much loss of freedom; but there was a gain in strength and compactness, in a clear consciousness of vocation. This was the Church which preserved Christianity in the world.

II

Early Fathers.—Four great men of this period need special mention. Irenæus succeeded to the leadership of the Church of Lyons after the persecution in 177 when the aged Bishop Pothinus was martyred. Irenæus was a disciple of Polycarp of Smyrna, who himself claimed to have been a hearer of St John, "the disciple of the Lord." Whoever the actual John may be, we have here a tradition stretching well back into the first century; for Polycarp had been eighty-six years a Christian (*i.e.* counting from baptism) when he was martyred about 155. Irenæus' great work is the five books, *Against Heresies*, in which he describes the various Gnostic systems and refutes them by the appeal to Church teaching as everywhere held and as proved by the Scriptures.

Hippolytus was almost a contemporary of Irenæus,

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, iv. 22. [2] Irenæus, *Adv. hær.*, iv. 26.

whom he is said to have heard lecture at Rome. He was a prolific writer, of immense learning, and widely known in his day. There is some mystery about his position in the Church. From his disparaging references to Callistus, Bishop of Rome, whom he regards as the ambitious leader of a sect and heretical into the bargain, it has been thought that Hippolytus himself was author of a schism, or possibly head of the Greek-speaking Christians at a time when the Roman Church was rapidly becoming Latin. During a persecution in 235 he was exiled to Sardinia, where he died as a martyr. The most interesting of his works is the *Refutation of all Heresies*, a valuable mine of information about the Gnostic sects.

Tertullian was the Church's first great Latin writer. Even at Rome, the language of the Church was Greek until at least the end of the second century. In North Africa Latin prevailed, it would seem, from the beginning. Tertullian was born at Carthage, of pagan parents. He was well educated, especially in Roman Law. Attracted probably by the courage of Christians under persecution he was converted and used his great literary gifts for the Church. His writings include several apologetic works, more bitter in tone than the temperate Greek apologies; a long doctrinal work against Marcion; and many shorter ethical and theological essays. His fierce temperament led him always to extremes, and in middle life he joined the Montanists, finding their rigid asceticism and spiritual enthusiasm more congenial than the ordinary life of the Church. Tertullian's doctrine is, however, strictly orthodox, and he is the father of Latin theology,

such words as Trinity, substance, person, sacrament, and satisfaction being first found in their Latin form in his writings. No early Father is more valuable to us than Tertullian, for the vivid picture he gives of both pagan and Christian life. Persecution was prevalent during the earlier part of his life, yet he himself escaped, in spite of his vigorous denunciations of the persecutors.

Cyprian, a wealthy and educated man, by profession an orator and teacher of rhetoric, continued the work of Tertullian at Carthage. Converted in middle life, he was almost immediately made bishop (about 248), by reason of his outstanding position and character. His episcopate was marked by many struggles: first, against the persecution of Decius, during which he went into retirement for fourteen months; then, against disorders within the Church. Many had lapsed during the persecution, and when peace was restored asked to be received to communion again. Confessors, *i.e.* men who had suffered, claimed authority to readmit the lapsed, often on the easiest terms. A stricter party, led by Novatian, a Roman presbyter, would have excluded them altogether. A council of African bishops, under the presidency of Cyprian, took a more reasonable middle course. After an interval persecution broke out again under Valerian, and this time Cyprian would not escape. He was taken and beheaded in 258. In Cyprian the theory of the Catholic Church finds clear expression. It is one visible body, presided over by its bishops, each of whom is free and independent in his own sphere, and yet acts in council with the others for the good of the whole. Through this Church alone is

salvation possible. He who is not within it is not a Christian.[1]

III

Protests against Church Development.—There were, as we should expect, protests against the course which the Church followed. Marcion, a native of Pontus, who came to Rome just after the middle of the second century, took over from Cerdo, an unorthodox Syrian teacher, the doctrine that the Old Testament was due to an inferior God of righteousness, while the Gospel came from the God of love. This was Gnostic dualism, and Marcion is generally styled a Gnostic. But he differs from the Gnostics in that his system was religious, giving rise to an influential Church which produced martyrs, whereas Gnosticism was mainly a philosophy. Having rejected the Jewish Old Testament, Marcion maintained that St Paul, the anti-Judaic Apostle, alone understood the Gospel. We have here a reaction to St Paul from the intellectualism of the Apologists. For an account of our Lord's life Marcion selected St Luke, written by St Paul's companion and in tone the least Jewish of the four. But like all the dualists, he refused to admit a real incarnation. All the birth-story, which represented Jesus as lowly and poor, was omitted. "Take away that everlasting annoyance of Cæsar's census, the petty inn, the mean swaddling-clothes and the rude stable."[2] With this thorough-going Docetism went a severely ascetic rule of life, which forbade flesh meat, wine, and marriage.

[1] Cyprian, *Epist.*, li. 24.
[2] Tertullian, *De carne Christi*, ii.

Marcion's followers were numerous and his church continued to exist for some centuries.

If Marcionism is a protest against the Church's faith, Montanism may be regarded as a protest against rigid Church organisation. Montanus came fron Phrygia, that home of excitement and fanaticism, and taught that he was the organ or mouthpiece of the Paraclete, through whom, in ecstatic prophecy, fresh revelations were being given to the Church. Two women disciples, Prisca and Maximilla, were also endowed with this gift of prophecy. They foretold an approaching Second Advent, and many of their followers settled at Pepuza in Phrygia, where the New Jerusalem was to descend from heaven. It was just this uncontrolled emotionalism which St Paul had found it necessary to check. The Churches of Asia Minor still more decisively rejected the new "prophets," holding them to be inspired by Satan rather than the Holy Spirit. With this judgment Rome and the West agreed. Montanism represents the last effort to retain in the Church a free and personally inspired ministry, which had been a common feature at the beginning. The Montanists were not heretical in doctrine, and in conduct they were more extreme than the Church, keeping stricter fasts, disallowing second marriages and refusing absolution for grave sins. Their greatest convert was Tertullian. Perpetua and Felicitas, martyrs at Carthage about 202, may have been Montanists. Their *Acts*, *i.e.* the record of their martyrdom, is a work which contains visions and revelations, and is sometimes thought to have been edited by Tertullian himself.

BOOKS

Ante-Nicene Christian Library. Vols. on "Irenæus," "Tertullian," Hippolytus," "Cyprian," etc.

F. R. M. Hitchcock: *Translation of St Irenæus against the Heresies.* S.P.C.K. 2 vols. at 2s. 6d.

F. Legge: *Translation of Hippolytus' Philosophumena, or the Refutation of all Heresies.* T. & T. Clark. 14s.

R. Rainy: *The Ancient Catholic Church.* S.P.C.K. 2 vols. at 30s.

CHAPTER VII

ALEXANDRIA

I

Origin of the Catechetical School.—While the Church in the West was consolidating itself, by a definite Creed, Scripture and Ministry, the East was engaged in thought. There was, of course, much theological thought in the West, but it generally had there a practical aim, looking to conduct, law and order. In the East thought was speculative, looking to truth. The earliest Eastern centre of Christian thought was Alexandria. So far back as the time of Christ, Philo, an Alexandrian Jew, had attempted to interpret the Old Testament by means of Greek philosophy. To do this he neglected the literal meaning and drew the doctrines of Plato out of Moses by unrestrained allegorising. The Greek idea of the Logos, the guiding principle of the universe, originally taught by Heracleitus (500 B.C.) was first equated with the Old Testament "Word of the Lord," [1] and then half personified and conceived as the highest of the powers through which God acts on the material world.

Philo may perhaps have influenced the writer of the Fourth Gospel, and less likely St Paul and the writer to the Hebrews. Certainly his type of thought

[1] *E.g.*, Ps. xxxiii. 6.

had great effect on the Church in Alexandria. We know very little about the organisation of that Church in the first and early second centuries. It seems to have lagged behind the West in the matter of government, for according to Jerome the bishops were until 150 consecrated by the body of presbyters out of which they were taken. But in theology Alexandria was ahead of all other cities. A "Catechetical School" (*i.e.* one in which discussion played an important part, as in the Greek philosophical schools) was founded, for the purpose of presenting Christian doctrine to the educated Greek world. Continuing the work of Philo, the school taught that both the Old Testament and Greek philosophy helped in preparing the way for Christ. Both were therefore worthy of study. Common men accepted Christianity on faith; but those who had the power might proceed from faith to knowledge, not the false kind which the Gnostics imagined, but the true. The enlightened Christian was the true Gnostic.

II

Pantænus and Clement.—Of the earliest teacher, Pantænus, we know almost nothing. His disciple and successor, Clement, marks the beginning of a new stage in Christian thought. Born about 150, he tells us that he had travelled in many lands seeking knowledge. At last he found in the Christian faith the object of his quest. He settled at Alexandria, and taught there from about 185 till the outbreak of persecution under Severus in 202. Then he retired from Alexandria, never to return. We

get one more glimpse of him. In 211 he was the bearer of a letter from an old pupil, Alexander, afterwards Bishop of Jerusalem, to the Church of Antioch. In this letter he is called "Clement the blessed presbyter, a man virtuous and approved."

Three important works of Clement have come down to us. *The Exhortation to the Greeks* is an apology, and the finest of all the apologies. Beginning with a passage full of beauty, in which Christ is described as the new Orpheus, who draws men after him, the book goes on to attack the mystery-religions and image-worship, and ends with an eloquent appeal to the reader to choose between life and death. Following this is the *Pedagogue* or Tutor, a detailed treatise on conduct, from which we gain much insight into the life of the time. Lastly, a theological work, written with little order or method, and called on that account *Stromateis*[1] or Miscellanies. Clement wrote another large work called the *Outlines*, or notes on many of the books of the Bible, but of this only a few fragments remain. We possess, however, a small but very interesting sermon on *The Rich Man's Salvation*, based on St Mark x. 17–31, in which Clement stoutly maintains that the rich man has a place in the Church, provided he realises that his wealth is a trust from God, and gives generous alms. Others had apparently taught that rich men were excluded from salvation unless they gave up everything.

The sermon on the rich man is an indication that the Church was settling down in the world and

[1] Literally, the striped or many-coloured bag in which bed-clothes were rolled up. Hence a fanciful name, used by many ancient writers for a loosely-arranged literary work.

coming to terms with human society. Clement's theological work is an attempt to come to terms with human thought. In the West the bare statements of the Creed were for the most part enough; faith and theology were the same. In the East, too, there were some who said "Only believe." It was necessary, however, for the Church to think out her faith, and this involved a study of Greek philosophy. Clement maintained that the philosophers, and Plato especially, taught much that was true. Even the writings of the heretics must be studied; else how could they be refuted? Clement himself was no great thinker, but he understood the problem and prepared the ground for his successors.

III

Origen.—His immediate successor, and one of the greatest of all Christian thinkers, was Origen. Born in a Christian family about 185, his father was martyred in the persecution of Severus, and Origen wished to share his fate, but was fortunately prevented. At the age of eighteen he took over the catechetical school on Clement's retirement, and spent many years in successful teaching and writing. On a visit to Cæsarea in Palestine, he was allowed by the bishop to expound the Scriptures in church, though still a layman. This aroused the jealousy of many, and in particular of Demetrius, Bishop of Alexandria, who thereupon ordered him to return. It proved impossible, however, for him to work with Demetrius, who shortly after called a Synod, which forbade Origen to teach at Alexandria, and excom-

municated him. He went to Cæsarea, where he was honourably received, admitted to the priesthood, and allowed to work for more than twenty years. In the persecution under Decius he was put in prison and tortured. He was released on the death of Decius, but, broken in health by his sufferings, died in 253.

Origen's literary output was immense. He wrote commentaries on practically the whole Bible, of which the chief surviving work is that on St John. But his main title to fame rests on the *First Principles*, a systematic treatise on theology. This was written when Origen was young. It is a pioneer work, to which all subsequent theology owes a debt. Most of it is extant only in a free Latin translation made by Rufinus, who did not scruple to alter some of the more daring speculations of the original. Origen discusses the Holy Trinity. The Father is the transcendent and absolute Being; the Son is subordinate to Him; and the Holy Spirit subordinate to the Son. The subordination of the Son, afterwards exaggerated by Arius, helped to bring Origen's theology into disfavour with many. Origen also discussed angels, demons, and the creation of the world. He stressed free-will to the utmost. Men can choose good or evil, and wrong choice is followed by punishment. Difficulties like the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, which made free choice seem impossible, are solved by the theory of pre-existence, men's position and character being determined by their conduct in a previous life. Both men and demons, in fact all rational creatures, were angelic spirits who have fallen in varying degrees through wrong choice. But the fall is not irrevocable,

and Origen looks forward to the final restoration of all.

A valuable defence of Christianity is contained in the treatise *Against Celsus*. The latter, a pagan writer of culture and ability, of whom outside Origen nothing is known, had attacked Christianity in a way that reads surprisingly modern, deriding the Incarnation as absurd, and miracles as incredible. Origen was induced to answer him, and by taking each paragraph in turn he has preserved for us most of the attack as well as his own defence. Celsus betrays the scorn of the superior man for the hopes and ideals, no less than the beliefs, of Christians. Referring to the hope of uniting all nations in Christ, he says: "Anyone who thinks this possible, knows nothing." Origen replies that it is not only possible, but true, that every rational being shall be brought under one law.[1] Many of Origen's arguments would hardly carry conviction to-day, yet the reader feels that Celsus, for all his knowledge and assurance, belongs to a dying world, whereas the Christians, difficult though their faith may be, have the promise of the future.

Origen's teaching was so wide and varied, and his speculations so bold and original, that they could hardly fail to provoke opposition. A long controversy arose in the fourth century between Origenists and anti-Origenists, which resulted in the condemnation of Origen as a heretic at the Council of Constantinople in 553.

[1] Origen, *Contra Celsum*, viii. 72.

BOOKS

James Drummond: *Philo Judæus.* Williams & Norgate. 2 vols. at 21s.

Ante-Nicene Christian Library. Vols. on "Clement" and "Origen."

R. B. Tollinton: *Clement of Alexandria.* Williams & Norgate. 2 vols. at 21s.

John Patrick: *Clement of Alexandria.* Blackwood. 7s. 6d.

C. Bigg: *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria.* Oxford Press. 14s.

CHAPTER VIII

CHURCH AND STATE FROM 180 TO 260

I

Decline of Empire and Progress of Christianity.—Towards the end of the second century a notable decline of the Empire had set in. Outwardly it was strong and prosperous, yet the population was diminishing and the burden of taxes for the support of army and court grew heavier. The army had long ceased to be Roman, and was now recruited mainly from the outlying provinces. Its leaders were often men of barbarian stock, brave and capable perhaps, but ignorant of the traditions of Rome. The Emperors had hitherto controlled the army; but after the reign of Commodus the army realised its strength and not seldom dictated the choice of Emperor. Added to this internal weakness was the menace of the barbarians. There were constant attacks on the frontiers by the tribes of Northern and Central Europe from 180 till the end of the third century. In the East the Parthians were active.

To meet these perils a united Empire, with a strong central government, was necessary. In 212 the Roman citizenship was extended by Caracalla over the whole Empire. But a deeper, spiritual unity was also being sought for. If the first century was cynical and indifferent, the second was a time

of deepening religious feeling. The traditional state religions of Greece and Rome had lost their hold, and a desire for monotheism becomes evident. Mystery religions, in which the worshipper unites himself to a single god or goddess, without of course denying the existence of others, grew in importance. These religions tried to answer the soul's need for salvation and immortality, about which the state worship was silent. Isis, Serapis and Mithras were especially popular as mystery deities, and their temples were to be found all over the Empire.

In this religious revival Christianity shared. After 150 it is no longer an obscure cult, practised in secret by a few fanatics. It is well known, and recognised, as a possible world religion. Celsus' work against it [1] witnesses to its importance. Celsus had read the Gospels and knew accurately enough the main points of Christian teaching, though he had not the spiritual insight to discern its real strength, and was too easily tempted to indulge in shallow mockery. Educated men and women were entering the Church, all grades of society being represented. It is noticeable that in the third century the charges of immorality in connexion with Christian worship disappear. Moreover, the Church was growing extensively. The third century saw a rapid expansion in North Africa and Gaul, with considerable progress in Spain and Britain. In Egypt there was a movement beyond the Greek Church of Clement and Origen to the native people. In Syria the Church was firmly planted by 190, with outposts farther east. The time was coming when the relation of the new religion to the Empire would need to be defined.

[1] See p. 57.

It must be either an ally to be welcomed, or an opponent to be crushed.

II

Beginnings of Systematic Persecution.—Christianity had, as we have seen, never been a legal religion. The common law of the Empire did not recognise it as a religion, and it could always be said of Christians, *non licet esse vos* (it is not lawful for you to exist). In practice, however, there had been much toleration, and persecution had been unsystematic. Severus, who succeeded Commodus in 193, for some years let Christians alone and was even friendly to them. His wife, Julia Domna, a Syrian lady, was attached to Eastern cults and had none of the Roman prejudice. It was at her request that Philostratus composed *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, a religious teacher and reformer of the first century. After a while Severus took alarm at the number of men of rank who were accepting Christianity. To check this, he issued an edict forbidding fresh conversions. This was a new method of persecution. The limited scope of the edict did not in fact secure protection for Christians of long standing, but it drew special attention to recent converts, such as Perpetua at Carthage. Severus died in 211, and there followed a period of peace, lasting nearly forty years, with a few slight local interruptions. Caracalla (211–217) was occupied in fighting with the Germans and Parthians; Elagabalus (218–222) was a devotee of Syrian sun-worship, who would have included all religions,

not excepting Christianity, within his own; and Alexander Severus (222–235) also favoured an eclectic system. His mother, Julia Mamæa, summoned Origen to Antioch in order to hear him lecture. Severus himself put statues of Christ, with Apollonius, Orpheus, Abraham and the deified Emperors, in his private chapel. A dispute having arisen about a piece of land near Rome, which was claimed by Christians and by a company of cooks, he gave it to the former, saying, that it was better any god should be worshipped there rather than that the land should be given to cooks.

Alexander was succeeded by Maximinus, a Thracian (235–238), who initiated a persecution, as Eusebius says, "on account of his hatred towards the household of Alexander, which contained many believers."[1] Unlike earlier persecutions, this was directed against bishops only. It was probably at this time that Hippolytus[2] and Pontianus were sent to the Sardinian mines. But Maximinus' reign was short, and under Gordian (238–244) and Philip (244–248) peace was restored. Eusebius says indeed that Philip was actually a Christian and corresponded with Origen.[3] Christianity had thus penetrated almost to the throne, and a feeling of security grew up, which was soon to be rudely shaken.

III

Decius and Valerian.—In 248 Philip was succeeded by Decius, a soldier who looked back to Trajan as his

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, vi. 28.
[2] See p. 47.
[3] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, vi. 34.

model. The year 248 was the one-thousandth anniversary of the founding of Rome, and in the celebration of this event old memories and traditions of the city's greatness were revived. Yet men were aware that the Empire was seriously attacked and in danger. A plague, too, began in 250 and raged for fifteen years. The populace attributed these misfortunes to the rise of Christianity and the neglect of the ancient gods, who had made Rome great. Christians were inclined to refuse public offices and army service. Their vast organisation seemed to be a state within the state. How could it be anything but a source of weakness ?

Decius was a good but narrow-minded man. He saw, when campaigning against the barbarians, how greatly the Roman army had degenerated. The men had no religion and their morals were dissolute. He resolved to restore the old life and spirit ; and as a first step he opened an attack on the Church. This was the first universal and systematic persecution. A date was announced in 250 by which all people, men and women alike, were to declare their pagan belief. Those who did not would be taken to be Christians. A visit to a temple, the offering of a sacrifice or incense, the express renunciation of Christ and joining in a sacrificial meal, was the method laid down. This done, the worshipper was given a *libellus* or ticket, with his name, address, age, the date of sacrificing, and any special marks of identity. Those who refused were imprisoned and tortured in order to secure their apostasy, and only when this failed was the death penalty resorted to.

In an onslaught like this it is natural that apostates

should be numerous, both among clergy and laity. Many bought tickets without sacrificing. But there were many martyrs, including Fabian, the Bishop of Rome; while others died in prison. Decius, however, did not live to see the issue of his policy. He was killed the next year, when fighting on the Danube, and his successor Gallus (251–253) did not enforce the edict. Whatever popular feeling there may have been against Christians, there could have been little enthusiasm for Decius' method of persecution, which ceased as soon as his orders were no longer effective. Probably most of the magistrates disliked their task. Gallus soon gave place to Valerian, who had actively supported Decius in his persecuting policy. Strange to say, Valerian left the Church in peace till 257. Then he changed, at the urgent request, it was believed, of his general Macrianus. Possibly many counsellors of the old school felt that either Christianity or the Empire must perish. Valerian adopted a new policy. A milder edict in 257 proving ineffective, he issued another in 258. The object was to break up the Church, the Christian corporation, now so powerful. Churches and cemeteries, the Christian meeting-places, were confiscated. Christian leaders, bishops and prominent clergy, were to suffer death. Rich laymen were to be exiled and their goods confiscated. Non-official or unimportant people were not touched.

In this attack Cyprian of Carthage and Sextus, Bishop of Rome, with Laurence the Deacon, perished. But like its predecessors it came to a sudden end. Valerian was in the East, fighting against the Persians. He was surrounded, forced to a conference, treacherously seized and put into

prison, where he died. The might of Rome had sunk so low that it was unable to rescue him. Gallienus his son gave up the struggle with the Church. In an edict he restored to the bishops the cemeteries and churches. Though the common law which made Christianity illegal was not modified, a practical toleration was expressly granted, and few Christians could have supposed that it would ever again be withdrawn.

BOOKS

F. J. Foakes Jackson, *Studies in the Life of the Early Church*. Hodder. 10s. 6d.

H. M. Gwatkin, *Early Church History to* A.D. 313. Macmillan. 2 vols at 21s.

H. B. Workman : *Persecution in the Early Church*. Epworth Press. 3s. 6d.

CHAPTER IX

THE LONG PEACE AND THE FINAL PERSECUTION

I

Church Organisation and Discipline.—The victory over Decius and Valerian, for it was nothing less, must have given the Church a fresh consciousness of her unconquerable strength. This strength came from her faith, but it was expressed in, and augmented by, her organisation. The keystone of this was the episcopal system. The bishops were rulers of the Church and guardians of doctrine. Each city had its own bishop, with presbyters and deacons under him. In theory all bishops were equal, but practically, as was inevitable, special prominence was attached to bishops of great cities like Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, Jerusalem, and above all, Rome.

The clergy were a distinct body of men, admitted to their office by ordination at the hands of the bishops, after the primitive custom. They were the bishop's representatives, and administered the sacraments by his permission. Deacons were the bishop's servants and advisers. At Rome they numbered seven, in accordance with the original number in Acts. There were also various minor orders, sub-deacons, acolytes, exorcists, readers, janitors. The ministry of women was recognised in deacon-

esses, whose status, however, was higher in the East than in the West. The higher clergy did not engage in trade, but were supported by the alms of their people.

The sacraments were held in the highest honour and celebrated with much solemnity. Baptism was preceded by a long preparation, ending with the teaching of the Creed to the catechumen. Until the third century few but adults were baptized. Tertullian discouraged early baptism, but Origen and Cyprian favoured it. Infant baptism, though doubtless occurring quite early, did not become general till the sixth century. The methods of immersion and affusion were both practised.

The Eucharist had now been completely separated from its early accompaniment, the Agape or Love-feast, and was celebrated in the morning, before the first meal of the day. It was the Christian act of worship, and as such was regarded as sacrificial, in accordance with both Jewish and pagan modes of thought. "The sacrifice we offer," says Cyprian, "is the Lord's Passion."[1] So the offerer was regarded as a priest, in a sense analogous to that of Jewish and pagan priesthoods. The belief that the Eucharist was a representation of the Drama of the Passion led to the use of an elaborate ceremonial and an ordered liturgy. For this purpose large and ornate churches were built, particularly in the latter half of the third century.

It was held that Baptism remitted all previous sins and assured the convert of salvation. There was, however, a strong tendency to regard serious sins committed after baptism as beyond forgiveness,

[1] Cyprian, *Epist.*, lxii. 17.

so far as the Church was concerned. Idolatry, adultery and murder would cut off the offender from the Church without hope of reconciliation. This stern view was felt to receive support from Hebrews vi. 4–6, but various efforts were made to modify it. Hermas had announced a second opportunity of repentance,[1] and Tertullian advocated one restoration to the Church after public confession. Some went further. Callistus, Bishop of Rome (217–222), the adversary of Hippolytus,[2] offered to restore any, even after sins of impurity, on due repentance. For this he was fiercely opposed by Tertullian.

Two such questions of discipline arose at Carthage after the Decian persecution. The confessors, *i.e.* those who had suffered in the persecution without actually dying, were afterwards held in great veneration. Relying on their merits, they presumed to readmit on easy terms all who had lapsed. This was strenuously opposed by Cyprian, who held that Church discipline must be exercised by the bishops and not by unauthorised persons, however estimable. Some took the opposite line of extreme rigour, both at Carthage and at Rome. Novatian, a Roman presbyter, not only opposed all readmission of the lapsed, but formed a schism which lasted till the sixth century. The general feeling of the Church was against him, and by degrees it became recognised that all sins were forgivable upon repentance.

These controversies bring into view a wider question. In the beginning a high standard had been expected of all Christians, though St Paul's

[1] See pp. 24-25.

[2] See pp. 46-47.

Epistles are enough to show that it had never been reached universally. But, in theory at least, the Church was a body of saints. As numbers increased, lower standards were necessarily accepted; and in consequence a distinction begins to arise between ordinary and higher Christians. It was felt that the highest life lay in a literal imitation of our Lord, who lived in poverty and detached from all worldly ties. Any deliberate acceptance of suffering, or any striking act of renunciation, was regarded as meritorious. The most obvious sacrifice that could be made by all alike was to abstain from marriage. Consequently the unmarried, whether men or women, were highly honoured. This ascetic tendency originated among the laity; but it is reflected in the attempts made, from the third century onwards, to prohibit clerical marriage.

II

The Diocletian Persecution.—The long peace was nearly broken by Aurelian, who issued a persecuting edict in 274, but died before it could be carried into effect. Aurelian had previously been called upon to adjudicate in a matter of Church property. Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch (260–272) had been deposed by a Synod of fellow-bishops for heresy. He still retained, however, the episcopal house. When appeal was made to Aurelian, he decided that the house should be given to that bishop who was in communion with Rome, which Paul after his excommunication was not. Aurelian's action was not due to friendliness toward the Church, but to

the fact that after Gallienus had given back the Church buildings Christianity was in some sense a lawful religion.

After Aurelian's death in 275, a period of confusion followed till the accession of Diocletian in 284. He was of humble origin, but great ability. To secure better imperial government, and a clear and recognised succession, Diocletian divided the Empire into two parts, East and West. He himself resided in the East at Nicomedia, while he appointed a second "Augustus" at Rome, Maximian. Each "Augustus" was assisted by a "Cæsar," who would succeed him, Constantius in the West and Galerius in the East. Diocletian left the Church in peace for nearly twenty years. He had reason to, for his wife and daughter were Christians, and so were many others in the imperial household. Galerius hated the Christians, and was no doubt hated by them in return; certainly they would fear his succession. It is said that Diocletian was urged to persecute by Galerius; but he must have had his own reasons as well. He was, like Decius, of the old school, and probably felt the Church to be a source of weakness to the Empire. In 303 he issued his first edict, which resembled that of Valerian, with some important changes. No meetings were to be held, churches were to be destroyed, the Scriptures to be burnt, the clergy to lose all civil rights and palace servants their freedom. The intention plainly was to avoid bloodshed. Then followed two fires at the palace, which Galerius ascribed to the Christians. Fierce vengeance was taken, quite apart, of course, from the edict. Another edict followed, by which the clergy were imprisoned, and a third, promising them

freedom if they would recant, and allowing torture as a merciful inducement to recantation. This represents all for which Diocletian is personally responsible. His ideas are clear: get rid, not of Christians, but of their buildings, their sacred books and their officials, and the Church will collapse.

In 304, when Diocletian was ill, Maximian issued an edict which went far beyond Diocletian's plans. He ordered all Christians to sacrifice on pain of death. Cruel scenes followed in many parts of the Empire, but the edict was not equally observed everywhere. Constantius in Britain pulled down some churches, but did little else. In 305, according to Diocletian's plan, he and Maximian retired, leaving Galerius and Constantius as Emperors, with two new Cæsars, Severus in the West and Maximinus Daia in the East. The accession of Constantius resulted in the practical cessation of persecution in the West, where he ruled, and even in the East there was some relaxation. In 306 Constantius died at York, and his son Constantine, who had been excluded from the succession because of his leanings towards Christianity, was proclaimed by his troops as Emperor. A struggle ensued, in which the retired Maximian and his son Maxentius defeated Severus, whose place was taken by Licinius. But Constantine gradually gathered strength, and after negotiations with Maximian, who proved faithless, forced him to commit suicide in 310. Thus two leaders only, Constantine and Maxentius, remained in the West.

In the East the tale of cruelty went on, with some changes but no real cessation. Maximinus Daia and Licinius were as bitter and relentless as Galerius himself. But relief was at hand. Galerius was

stricken with a terrible illness, soon to prove fatal. He induced Licinius to join him in publishing an edict of toleration in 311. It is one of the most astonishing documents of history. The dying Emperor gives reasons for his acts. He wanted the Christians to worship the Roman gods, rather than to give up their own. They will not do the first, and he has prevented them from worshipping their own God. This he now sees to be a mistake. They may therefore assemble again for worship, and he requests that they will pray to their God for him. A few days after he died.

III

The Edict of Milan.—There were now four rulers alive, two supposed to be friendly to Christianity and two hostile. Of the former, Constantine had seen the folly of persecution and, though not himself a Christian, looked to Christianity as the only spiritual force strong enough to bind the Empire together. Licinius was guided by circumstances. The first task was to crush Maxentius, who without any authority claimed the whole of the West as his province. Constantine invaded Italy, met Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge near Rome, and defeated and killed him. Marching northwards he joined Licinius at Milan where, late in 312 or early in 313, the great edict of toleration was issued. Every man might now worship according to his own conscience. This was the Church's charter of freedom.

Ten years, however, were to pass before the final settlement came. Maximinus Daia had gone his own way after the death of Galerius. He had even

attempted to set up a pagan hierarchy in rivalry with Christianity, and to cause slanderous perversions of the faith to be taught in schools. As soon as the Edict of Milan was published, he hastened to attack Licinius, and was defeated at Adrianople. He escaped with difficulty and shortly afterwards died at Tarsus. Two rulers were now left, and it proved impossible for them to remain at friendship. As Constantine tended more and more towards Christianity, so Licinius in the East resorted again to persecution. He was jealous of his stronger rival and probably provoked the war that followed. In 323 he was defeated and killed, and Constantine remained sole monarch of the Roman world.

BOOKS

Ante-Nicene Christian Library. See Vol. "Lactantius (II)," "The manner in which the Persecutors died."

H. M. Gwatkin: *Early Church History to* A.D. 313.

Leighton Pullan: *The Church of the Fathers*.

CHAPTER X

ARIANISM

I

Early Christological Heresies.—When the last persecutor had died, it must have seemed to Christians as if a new age of universal happiness was at hand. Small wonder that they flattered Constantine and forgot his faults. Constantine, on his part, was sincerely anxious for a united Empire. He gave the Church the fullest possible freedom. The clergy were exempted from taxation and public duties. Sunday was made a holiday by the closing of the law courts and the cessation of public works. Animal sacrifice was prohibited. But the removal of the strain of persecution only brought to the front theological questions which had disturbed the Church even in the days of peril.

From the beginning, Christ was for Christians an object of worship. But the question would naturally arise: "What is His relationship to God?" This question was, in principle, settled by the acceptance of the Fourth Gospel, in which Christ is the Word of God, eternally co-essential with the Father, and incarnate in Jesus. But there were many to whom this theology was unacceptable. It seemed to them to involve the worship of two Gods, or, if the Spirit were included, of three. These opponents

of the Logos doctrine (some of whom were actually called *Alogi*) may be classed under the general term Monarchians, because they asserted the Unity and Supremacy of God. Given this doctrine, there were two ways of accounting for the place occupied by Jesus Christ in the thought of the Church. The first is called Modalism, which represents the one God as manifesting Himself in various modes or phases. Noetus taught in Asia Minor about 180 or 200 that "Christ was the Father himself, and that the Father was born, and suffered, and died."[1] Praxeas introduced this doctrine to Rome about 190. In the caustic words of Tertullian: "He put to flight the Paraclete, and crucified the Father."[2] These descriptions come from their adversaries, and are purposely crude. The greatest teacher of this school was Sabellius, who was active at Rome early in the third century. From him the heresy is often called Sabellianism. The Son and the Holy Spirit are manifestations of the one God, just as light and heat are manifestations of the sun. The manifestations were temporary, for the special purpose of redemption, and ultimately all would be reabsorbed into the Godhead.

The second way was to borrow the Greek idea of inferior deities and to suppose that Jesus was made the Son of God at some definite time, generally at his baptism. This is called Adoptionism, or Dynamic Monarchianism. Theodotus of Byzantium taught in Rome about 190 that Jesus was a mere man who for his holy life was adopted as the Son of God. This teaching was continued by another Theodotus, the "money-changer," and later on by Artemon.

[1] Hippolytus, *Against Noetus*, 1. [2] Tertullian, *Praxeas*, 1.

In the East it lasted longer, its great representative being Paul of Samosata,[1] who asserted that Jesus was a man, born of a virgin, filled with the Logos, and so united morally and inseparably, but not essentially with God. Paul was condemned in 269.

II

Arius and the Council of Nicæa.—Arius was born in 256 and was a prominent presbyter at Alexandria in the early years of the fourth century. Anxious to safeguard the unity of God, he pressed to an extreme Origen's doctrine of the subordination of the Son.[2] Origen, however, had also taught that the Son was eternally begotten by the Father, thus making the Sonship an essential relation. Arius abandoned this, and taught that Christ had a beginning; not in time, for his creation was the beginning of time itself, but, as the disputed phrase ran, "there was when he was not." Christ was a created being, the "first-born of all creation." Arius fell thus between two stools. His Christ was neither truly God nor truly man; he was an inferior deity, or demi-god, of the ordinary Greek type. This in fact was one of the specious merits of his system; it attracted pagans, who were familiar with such beings in their mythology.

A controversy arose between Arius and his bishop Alexander, and in a Synod held about 320 Arius was condemned. He appealed to Eusebius of Nicomedia, who was in favour with Constantine. The disturbance caused throughout the East by this

[1] See p. 69.

[2] See p. 56.

controversy was quite contrary to the Emperor's desire for peace, and he wrote to Alexander expressing his hope that this "unprofitable question" might be peaceably settled. This proving of no avail, he called a General Council of the Church, which met at Nicæa in May 325. Some three hundred bishops attended, travelling at government expense. A few were avowedly in sympathy with Arius; a few others equally hostile. The majority probably were not decided. Constantine himself was present, and bade them cease from recrimination and seek for truth and peace.

Alexander was accompanied by his deacon Athanasius, then but twenty-eight years old. In spite of his youth, he had already written a work *On the Incarnation*, which marked him as a man of more than ordinary ability. Athanasius felt that what was at stake was the Christian doctrine of redemption. After the fashion of Greek thought, he looked upon the divine nature and human nature as two separate entities, the one corruptible and mortal, the other incorruptible and immortal. For the human nature to be saved, it must be permeated by the divine; hence the need that Christ should be genuinely a bearer of the divine life, *i.e.* of the essential nature of God. "Christ was made man," he wrote, "that we might be made divine." Athanasius was not a speculative thinker, but a devoted pastor. He was convinced that if Arianism conquered, the heart would be taken out of Christianity. For this conviction he fought, not only at the Council but for nearly fifty years after, in spite of opposition and suffering. That he was right in his main contention, few now would doubt. Besides that,

he has the credit of fighting without fear or flattery of those in high places, or desire of self-aggrandisement.

At the Council various Creeds were presented as containing the truth taught by the Church from of old. That of Eusebius of Nicomedia was instantly rejected. Eusebius of Cæsarea, the historian, then presented the Creed of his Church, which was examined and accepted with certain important additions. Chief of these was, "being of one substance with the Father," the phrase "of one substance" (*homoousios*) being a definite rejection of Arianism. All the bishops except two signed this Creed; but not all really favoured it. The word *homoousios* was not found in Scripture, and was felt to be Sabellian. Only a few Latin bishops attended, but these had no difficulty in agreeing to the decision; since in the West "three persons and one substance" had long been accepted as an orthodox formula. Arius and the two recalcitrant bishops were banished, and a superficial peace was restored.

III

Later History of the Arian Controversy.—In 328 Alexander died, and Athanasius, young as he was, succeeded to the bishopric. Many attempts were made by the friends of Arius to get him back. After much intrigue they succeeded in persuading Constantine that Athanasius was the main obstacle to peace, and in 336 he was banished to Treves, in Gaul. Arius was recalled to Alexandria, but died suddenly the night before he was to have been

readmitted to the communion of the Church. The next year Constantine also died. His three sons divided the Empire, but Constantine II died in 340, after which Constans ruled in the West and Constantius in the East. Meanwhile Athanasius had been recalled, but only for a short while. Through the influence of Eusebius of Nicomedia, now promoted to Constantinople, he was again driven from his see, and took refuge at Rome. In 347 Constantius allowed him again to return. Constans, who had consistently supported the Nicene cause, which was that of most of his subjects, was murdered in 350 by an aspirant to the throne, and it was three years before Constantius was able to avenge his death by crushing the usurper. In 353 he was sole ruler of the Empire.

The firmness of Athanasius made it appear to Constantius, who did not understand the importance of the issue, as if he were the sole cause of strife. Again he was banished, and took refuge with the monks in the Egyptian desert. The Arian party were now supreme. They used a colourless formula *homoios*—the Son is "like" the Father. But now a division arises. Of those who supported Arius only a few agreed strictly with him; most were afraid of the word *homoousios*, which seemed to obliterate the distinction between Father and Son. They preferred *homoiousios* "of like substance," but their meaning was almost the same as that of Athanasius. During Constantius' lifetime no reconciliation was possible. Synods were held at Arles in 353, Milan in 355 and Sirinium in 357, practically under the coercion of the Emperor, which restored communion between the West and the Asian East, and forbade

the use of *ousia* (substance, essence) or any of its compounds on the ground that such terms were unscriptural. When Constantius died in 361, Athanasius returned and tried to unite all who at heart were opposed to Arius. At a Synod in Alexandria, in 362, it was agreed to receive back Arian clergy provided they gave up their heresy and agreed to the Nicene formula. Athanasius was exiled again in the pagan reaction under the new Emperor Julian, and yet again under the Arian Valens in 365 ; but he was recalled the following year and thenceforth lived unmolested till his death in 373.

Meanwhile a generation of younger men was taking up the struggle : Basil, made Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia in 370, Gregory of Nyssa, his younger brother, and Gregory of Nazianzus, the friend of Basil. These, the great " Cappadocian Fathers," belonging at first to the Homoiousian party, gradually became firm upholders of the Nicene formula, in opposition to the extreme Arians. The question at issue was now widening into one which concerned the Holy Trinity, and not the Son only. Some Arians asserted that the Holy Spirit was a created being. Both Athanasius and the Cappadocians opposed this and used the term *homoousios* of the Spirit as of the Son. Three *hypostases* (personal subsistences, the term being not so clear-cut as our " persons ") in one *ousia* (essence, substance), was becoming the accepted formula for the Trinity. After the death of Valens, Gratian became Emperor in the West, and appointed Theodosius to rule in the East. Both were upholders of Nicæa, and under Theodosius a Synod, which is known as the Second General Council, was held in

Constantinople in 381. Basil himself had died in 379, but his brother Gregory was present, and Gregory of Nazianzus; the latter, much against his will, was made Bishop of Constantinople. The Nicene faith was re-affirmed, and the Macedonian[1] heresy, which denied the Godhead of the Holy Spirit, was rejected. It seems that no expanded Creed was put forth to express clearly the faith about the Holy Spirit; but such a Creed may have been before the Council, for it came into use shortly afterwards, and was fully recognised by the Council of Ephesus in 431. This is the Creed commonly called Nicene; but in fact the Nicene Creed ended with the words: "and in the Holy Ghost," and all that follows is due to Constantinople and Ephesus.

Arianism was severely repressed by Gratian and Theodosius. But this was not the end of it. Ulfila, born about 310, of Gothic extraction, was consecrated bishop by Eusebius of Nicomedia at Constantinople in 341 for missionary work among the Gothic tribes north of the Danube. He worked there, and then in the Roman dominions south of the Danube, for many years, and translated the Scriptures into Gothic. The teaching spread rapidly, and when the Goths invaded Italy in the fifth century, capturing Rome in 410, they came as Christians, but of the Arian sort. The same form of Christianity spread to the other northern tribes, Vandals, Burgundians and Lombards. The Franks remained longest in heathenism, but in 493 Clovis, their king, married Clotilda, a Burgundian princess, who was, as it happened, a Catholic. After some hesitation

[1] So called from Macedonius, Arian Bishop of Constantinople under Constantius.

Clovis accepted his wife's religion and the Franks became the first orthodox German tribe.

BOOKS

Gwatkin: *Studies of Arianism* and *The Arian Controversy.*

Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Vols. "Athanasius," "Basil," "Gregory Nazianzen," "Gregory of Nyssa."

Murray's *Dictionary of Christian Biography.* Articles: "Arius," "Athanasius," etc.

CHAPTER XI

THE CHRISTOLOGICAL CONTROVERSY

I

Apollinarianism.—The Councils of Nicæa and Constantinople had made it clear that the Church believed Christ to be in a true sense God. The question then arose: How are the divine and human natures united in him? The West had long settled this question in a practical way by saying that Jesus was one person, both God and man. But this is really no more than a statement of the problem, and was not satisfactory to the inquiring East. In the latter half of the fourth century Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea, a strong defender of the Nicene position, attempted a solution. He felt that if Christ were truly God and truly man, he would be two persons. To guard against this, he supposed that the Logos was united with a human body. Afterwards he modified this to a view based upon a threefold division of human nature into body, soul and spirit. The spirit is the seat of personality, and in Jesus this element was supplied by the Logos.

His opponents at once replied that this involved a mutilated humanity. If the spirit, the highest part of man, was not taken by the Logos, then the spirit was not redeemed. Apollinaris asserted that

if the spirit were taken, then personality must go with it, and Jesus would be an ordinary human being, no room being left for the divine. It is clear to us that Apollinaris was hampered by his mechanical view of a human nature divisible into parts, and by the belief of his age in the utter unlikeness of human and divine. Nevertheless, it would have been fatal to admit any theory that impaired the true humanity of Christ. Apollinaris was condemned at the Council of Constantinople, and again at Chalcedon in 451.

II

Nestorianism.—A different line of thought was followed by Nestorius, who became Bishop of Constantinople in 428. He came from Antioch, and had as predecessor in his doctrine a famous scholar and preacher of the school of Antioch, Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia. Theodore taught that the Logos united himself with the man Jesus in a union so close and inseparable that the two, like man and wife, became one. The union was one of will, moral and not essential. Nestorius was apparently a man of violent feelings and unrestrained speech. Theodore had advised him not to attack so fiercely the opinions of others; but Nestorius disregarded the warning, and soon became involved in a controversy with Cyril of Alexandria. There were well-known doctrinal differences between the schools of Antioch and Alexandria. The former examined the Scriptures critically, searching for the literal and historical meaning. This resulted in a deep appreciation of the human nature of Jesus. Alex-

andria, on the other hand, employing the allegorical method that had come down from Clement and Origen, exaggerated the divine nature to such an extent that the human seemed to be swallowed up in it.

Nestorius attacked the term *Theotokos*, applied to the Virgin Mary. Its literal meaning is God-bearer, but it came practically to mean Mother of God; a phrase harmless perhaps in the mind of an educated man, but liable to pagan interpretations, as Nestorius pointed out, among the multitude. Cyril replied with a vehemence at least equal to that of Nestorius. Theologically, he was on surer ground than Nestorius when he maintained that to speak of the Logos joining himself with "the man Jesus" involved two persons, instead of one Christ. His own statements were often, however, little less dangerous, since he was reluctant to admit the reality of the human nature, and was charged with Apollinarianism. The dispute was complicated and embittered by the jealousy of Alexandria for the imperial city, and by the absence of kindly feeling and fairness on the part of Cyril. After anathemas and counter-anathemas had been hurled, and appeals made for support to Rome and other sees, the Emperor called a Council at Ephesus in 431. Before the Council met, Nestorius is said to have uttered the words which told heavily against him: "Never would I call a child of two or three months old, God." He himself repudiated this statement, explaining afterwards that what he said was: "God was not two or three months old." The fact is, that Nestorius was desperately anxious to keep the two natures apart. A form of speech had become

current, by which, in virtue of the oneness of Christ, what was strictly appropriate to one nature was predicted of the other: *e.g.* the blood of God, or, God died. Nestorius disliked this, and often took the language of Cyril to mean what it did not mean.

In spite of Cyril's occasionally doubtful statements, it is clear that the Council was right in rejecting Nestorianism, as it did. Nestorius himself was exiled, and after a few years of peace, was harried from place to place in Egypt till, worn out by disease and misery, he died in 451. It is a shameful story. But unlike most heresies, Nestorianism proved a vigorous faith. In spite of persecution, it spread through the East, reaching as far as China.

III

Eutychianism.—As we have seen, the danger of Cyril's position was that it minimised the human nature of Christ. On one occasion he had actually used the phrase "one incarnate nature of the Word." This idea was taken up by Eutyches, an aged monk of Constantinople, who taught what is called Monophysitism, or the doctrine of the one nature. Eutyches had little intellectual ability and was used by Dioscorus, who had succeeded Cyril at Alexandria, as a means of increasing the prestige of Alexandria at the expense of Constantinople. The formula, "two natures before the union; one after," was the Eutychian watchword, adopted to rule out any possibility of Nestorianism, which was still suspected in the adherents of the school of Antioch. It was

an indefensible position, for not only was there obviously no human nature of Christ existing before the Incarnation, but the " one nature " after meant practically that the human nature was lost sight of, swallowed up in the divine. Eutyches was charged with heresy and deposed. Then, owing to the efforts of Dioscorus, who was in favour with the Court, a Council was called at Ephesus in 449, in which Eutyches was restored, and the leading bishops in sympathy with Antiochian thought, Flavian of Constantinople, Eusebius of Dorylæum, Theodoret of Cyrus, near Antioch, and others were deposed.

Both sides had previously appealed for the support of Leo I at Rome. In reply he wrote his celebrated letter to Flavian, generally called the *Tome of Leo*. In this he set forth the Western view, which had been held continuously from the time of Tertullian, that in Christ two real and complete natures, divine and human, were united in one person. Dioscorus would not allow this letter to be read. When Leo heard the result of the Council, he called it a *latrocinium*, a synod of robbers, an epithet which has stuck to it ever since. The acts of the Council were, however, presumably as valid as those of any other, and might have exercised great influence on the Church, had not the Emperor Theodosius II died by an accident in 450. He was succeeded by his sister Pulcheria, a woman of fifty-one, who married a soldier still older, named Marcian. Both were on the orthodox side, and probably also apprehensive of the power which was centring in Alexandria, so far from the capital, under Dioscorus. Another Council was called at Chalcedon, opposite Constantinople, in 451, where the decisions of the *latrocinium*

were reversed, and a statement of faith adopted, which has remained ever since as the orthodox belief of Christendom. It reaches no real solution of the problems raised by the heretics, but simply puts side by side the beliefs which were felt to be necessary for the preservation of the Christian religion. Christ is, as divine, "consubstantial with the Father"; as human, "consubstantial with us." He is "to be acknowledged in two natures without confusion, change, division, separation; the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved and concurring in one Person . . . God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ."

IV

Later History of the Controversy.—One of the points left unsolved by the Chalcedonian Creed is: "How can a nature exist without its subject or *hypostasis;* or, as we should say, without a personality?" It was decided that the Word was *hypostasis* not only to his own proper nature, the divine, but to the human also. That is, the human nature had no human personality; it was impersonal; and Christ is man, not *a* man. The difficulty seems greater to us than it did to the Greeks, to whom a "nature" was a kind of substance, with an independent existence. None the less, the difficulty was felt, and Leontius of Byzantium (*c.* 485–543) tried to meet it by saying that while the human nature certainly needed its own *hypostasis*, and could not be conceived without it, in the Incarnation

the divine nature acted as hypostasis to the human. This theory is called Enhypostasis, and represents the last word of Greek theology on the question. Its effect is to submerge the human in the divine.

The Monophysites were not crushed by the Council of Chalcedon, but continued active in spite of the loss of their leaders. In the reign of Justinian an attempt was made to reconcile them by holding the Second Council of Constantinople in 553. This Council condemned three prominent leaders, whose writings were supposed to be Nestorian in character, *i.e.* Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Ibas, a Persian bishop. The condemnation was directed against what is called the Three Chapters, *i.e.* all the writings of Theodore, the reply of Theodoret to Cyril's twelve articles against Nestorius, and a letter of Ibas attacking Cyril. In the two latter instances it was the attack on Cyril for his alleged Apollinarianism that the Monophysites disliked. All three were therefore condemned, although they had been approved at Chalcedon. As one or other Council must have been wrong, this is one of the cases on which Article XXI of the Church of England relies for its assertion that "general councils have erred."

A further attempt at conciliation with the Monophysites, who remained strong in Egypt and Syria, was made by the Monothelites, who in the seventh century maintained that Christ, though possessed of two natures, acted in all things by one divine-human energy, *i.e.* one will. This was seen to involve a mutilation of the humanity, and was rejected at the Third Council of Constantinople in 680.

BOOKS

Murray's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. Articles on "Apollinaris," "Nestorius," "Cyril," "Theodore of Mopsuestia," "Eutyches," etc.

C. E. Raven: *Apollinarianism*. Cambridge Press. 12s. 6d.

H. M. Relton: *A Study in Christology*. S.P.C.K. 10s.

CHAPTER XII

FOUR GREAT FATHERS

I

St Ambrose.—Ambrose was the son of the Prætorian prefect of the Gauls, an imperial officer of very high rank, and was born, probably at Treves, about 340. He received a liberal education, and studied law with a view to public office. In 372 he was appointed Governor of Liguria and Aemilia, with Milan as his chief city. He made an excellent governor, both in character and ability, and was in high popular favour. Though brought up a Christian, he had deferred his baptism, as many were then wont to do. In 374 a new bishop was needed for Milan, where a schism had just been ended by the death of the Catholic and Arian claimants to the see. Ambrose was addressing the people on the duty of maintaining order in the election, when a voice from the crowd was heard: "Ambrose is bishop." The cry was taken up universally, and within eight days Ambrose had been baptized and raised by the necessary steps to the Episcopate.

His life as bishop is marked by trouble with the Arians, who soon regretted his appointment. After the Emperor Gratian was murdered (383), his stepmother Justina ruled on behalf of her son Valentinian II. She was an Arian, and demanded the

use of a church at Milan for her fellow-Arians. Ambrose successfully opposed her. Previously, when Symmachus, the most illustrious representative of pagan Rome, had asked for the restoration to the Senate-house of the golden statue and altar of Victory, which Gratian had removed, it was chiefly through the uncompromising opposition of Ambrose that the petition was rejected. We see Ambrose in a better light in his controversy with Theodosius. In anger at the murder of a governor, the Emperor had ordered a massacre at Thessalonica, in which seven thousand are said to have perished. Ambrose refused him admission to the Church services until he had publicly expressed his penitence for this deed.

The greatest act of his life was the baptism of Augustine. In his *Confessions*[1] the latter has given us a picture of the great bishop, snatching when he could a few moments from the press of callers and business in order to eat and read. He was an effective administrator, an eloquent preacher and a busy writer. He introduced the practice of antiphonal singing, and is the author of at least a dozen hymns, some of which are still widely known and sung. He died in 397, and was buried under the altar of his church in Milan, now called by his name.

II

St Augustine.—Augustine was born at Tagaste, near Carthage, in 354, his mother Monica being a Christian and his father a pagan. Owing to his

[1] Augustine, *Conf.*, vi. 3.

unusual ability, the parents made great efforts to secure for him a good education, and he was sent, first to a local school at Madaura and then to Carthage. His wild life at this time is described in his *Confessions*, probably with exaggerations. His association with the woman who was the mother of his boy Adeodatus was a faithful one, though he left her on his conversion. He practised as a rhetorician at Carthage, and afterwards at Rome and Milan. But when nineteen, a reading of Cicero's *Hortensius*, a work in praise of philosophy, rendered him dissatisfied with worldly ambitions and restlessly anxious for truth. In this state he was attracted by the Manichees, and remained for nine years an adherent of their sect.

Manicheism was called after Manes or Mani, an Oriental teacher born about 240. It was in essence a dualistic system, with elements derived from India and Persia, to which were added some Christian ideas. Its dualism explained human sin and the difficulties of the Old Testament, both being due to the evil principle in the universe. The true Manichee was a strict ascetic, avoiding marriage and the killing of any living thing, including plants. But the "hearer" was not bound by these rules, and Augustine remained a "hearer." The theological teaching of Manicheism seems to us so absurd that we wonder how Augustine could ever have entertained it; but he was ill at ease, and in deep need of spiritual help.

During this time his mother's prayers were unceasing. She went to a bishop, asking him to reason with her son, lest he should be utterly lost. The wise bishop refused, but added: "It cannot

be that the child of those tears should perish." At length Augustine began to see the futility of Manicheism, and gradually abandoned it.

About 383 he migrated to Rome, and soon afterwards obtained the post of professor of Rhetoric at Milan. Here he fell under the influence of Ambrose, who was then at the height of his fame as a preacher. Augustine listened to his sermons at first as models of rhetoric, but soon came to be interested in their teaching, and more than all in Ambrose himself, " a fellow-creature who was kind to me." At the same time he was attracted to Neoplatonism, which freed him from the Manichean idea that evil was a substance, and led him to understand that it had its origin in the will, and that goodness was the sole ultimate reality. In Neoplatonism, too, he found the doctrine of the eternal Word, but not the Word made flesh. The beauty of this philosophy threw into deeper relief the unsatisfactoriness of his life, and he was ripe for a complete change, which came suddenly one day in a garden at Milan in 386. He was baptized, gave up his public work and returned to Africa in 388, Monica having died in the interval.

In 391 he was ordained presbyter and soon afterwards (395) Bishop of Hippo, where he worked for nearly thirty-five years. This time was spent in pastoral work, in an extraordinary output of writing, and in two great controversies. The first was Donatism, which had its origin in the Diocletian persecution, when some clergy had given up the sacred books and were called *traditores*. The Donatists created a schism on grounds of discipline, refusing to hold communion with those whom they

alleged to be *traditores* or with others who associated with them. They were severely persecuted, but increased, and their wild North African character broke out in acts of personal violence to their opponents. Augustine's powerful reasoning had great effect in reconciling many, but others were only crushed by the arm of the State.

The second controversy was with Pelagius. Augustine had come to think that for every good act, even the initial act of faith towards God, we depend absolutely on divine grace. He reached this conclusion from a study of St Paul,[1] reinforced by his own experience. Pelagius urged that this destroyed human responsibility. Man could of his own will do good if he wished, although God always helped. In reply Augustine developed his doctrine of original sin, inherited from Adam, and making man totally corrupt. Salvation came through God's arbitrary predestination, not through man's choice. Pelagius, though at first accepted in the East, was finally condemned. The severe predestinarian doctrine of Augustine was afterwards considerably modified by the Church, but was revived at the Reformation by Luther and Calvin.

During Augustine's lifetime the decay of the Empire became apparent. Rome itself was taken and sacked by the Goths under Alaric in 410. In reply to pagan arguments that these misfortunes were due to the neglect of the old religion, Augustine wrote his *City of God*, tracing throughout history a spiritual kingdom belonging to God and a worldly empire opposed to it. This work had great influence in shaping the development of the

[1] Especially Rom. ix. 16.

mediæval Church, centred at Rome and claiming to exercise universal spiritual dominion as the embodiment of the City of God.

Augustine is clearly the most conspicuous figure in Church history outside the New Testament. He impressed his personality and doctrine alike on the mediæval Church and, through Luther and Calvin, on Protestantism. He will ever be important for his writings, but, as his friend and biographer Possidius tells us: "Not even they will supply, to those who knew him, the place of his voice and his presence." He died in 430.

III

St Jerome.—Jerome was almost a contemporary of Ambrose and Augustine, being born near Aquileia, in Venetia, about 346. After a youth of indecision, he resolved to join the Church, and was baptized before he was twenty. With a number of friends he formed a society for study and the cultivation of the ascetic life, included in which was Rufinus, the future translator of Origen's *First Principles*.[1] The society, however, broke up, and Jerome travelled to the East, taking with him his library. During a severe illness he was transported in a vision to the throne of God, and reproached for being no Christian but a Ciceronian, in allusion to his love for classical literature. Henceforward he renounced all but Scriptural study, and retired to a desert of Syria to become a hermit. He did not find solitude, but became immersed in controversies connected

[1] See p. 56.

with the see of Antioch, to which at the time there were three claimants. He went to Constantinople, where he learnt from Gregory of Nazianzus and became acquainted with Gregory of Nyssa, who led him to admire Origen. From thence he went to Rome.

At Rome he was admitted to a circle of nobly-born ladies, of whom Paula, a wealthy widow, and her daughters were chief. These were strongly influenced by his ascetic views, which regarded the unmarried state as the only possible one for a serious Christian. When difficulties arose with Roman society, Jerome again retired to the East, setting up a monastery at Bethlehem. Paula and her daughter Eustochium joined him, and became the heads of a neighbouring convent for women.

At Bethlehem Jerome lived for thirty-four years, from 386 to 420. His quick temper and unrestrained language brought him into one controversy after another. The growing reverence for relics, with all the superstitions involved in it, and the degradation of human life by the contempt felt for marriage, found in him a ready champion; and he wrote fiercely against Jovinian and Vigilantius, who had presumed to oppose the prevailing tendencies. Origen, whom he had at first praised, he afterwards condemned. A dispute with his bishop, John of Jerusalem, an admirer of Origen, caused him and his monks to be excommunicated for a time. His disputes with Rufinus and Augustine were largely personal. Rufinus had referred to Jerome in the preface to his translation of Origen's *First Principles* in terms which seemed to connect him with Origen, a thing which Jerome was then most anxious to

disclaim. An unseemly quarrel resulted, and Jerome's bitterness did not end even with Rufinus' death. Happily the difficulties with Augustine were due to a misunderstanding, which was removed and gave place to friendship and mutual respect.

Jerome was essentially a student. Though not, like Augustine, an original thinker, he was a wide reader and a worker of prodigious energy. Besides numerous Commentaries on the Scriptures, we possess many of his letters, which fully reveal his character, liable alike to form deep friendships and bitter enmities. But his greatest work was the translation of the Scriptures into a new Latin version from the original tongues. For the Old Testament he learnt Hebrew from a Jew, who through fear of his friends, came to him by night. The previous version was based on the Septuagint, of which there were many different texts. By going back to the original, Jerome bequeathed to the Western Church a priceless treasure, and his Vulgate, as it was afterwards called, has remained the Latin Bible till to-day.

IV

St Chrysostom.—John, called in later times "Chrysostomos," or the "golden-mouthed," from his wonderful oratory, was born at Antioch about 345. His mother Anthusa, left a widow at twenty, refused to consider a second marriage and devoted herself entirely to the care and training of her son. He was educated for the law, and listened at Antioch to the lectures of Libanius, the celebrated pagan

rhetorician, who declared that no man was more fitted to succeed him than John, "if the Christians had not stolen him from us." The law soon ceased to attract him, and he adopted, like so many Christians of his time, the strictly ascetic life. In deference to his mother's entreaties he did not leave home, but lived an almost silent and solitary life under her roof.

Chrysostom was unwilling to become a candidate for the ministry, although his eloquence and ability marked him out as worthy even of the Episcopate. Finally, in response to pressure, he agreed to be consecrated if his friend Basil would do the same. When the day came, Chrysostom was not to be found. Later he excused his broken promise on the ground that such a pious fraud, by which the Church had secured an excellent bishop in the reluctant Basil, was praiseworthy. After this, his mother perhaps having died, he spent six years in the mountains as a hermit, where he seriously impaired his health by excessive austerities, and was forced to return to Antioch.

His scruples apparently overcome, he was ordained priest, and soon established a reputation as a preacher. It fell to him to calm the citizens during the terrible days of 387 when, after a mad riot in which the Emperor's statue had been grossly insulted, the vengeance of Theodosius was hourly expected. Owing mainly to the intercession of the bishop, Flavian, the imperial pardon was obtained.

In 397 Chrysostom was appointed Bishop of Constantinople. Here the main troubles of his life began. He carried his austere habits, and solitary, unsociable life, into a bishop's palace, which

had been the scene of a somewhat luxurious hospitality. He spent his resources on the poor and hospitals. He tried to reform his clergy, some of whom lived careless and indolent lives, and some even worse. Unsparing to himself, he found it hard to make allowances for others. His temper was irritable, and his silence and aloofness caused him to be thought proud. Yet the people supported him, and thronged to his sermons, in spite of the exposure of their vices and follies which the preacher never omitted. The case became different when he attacked the high ladies of the Court, and even the Empress Eudoxia herself. At first she was friendly to him, but after the downfall of the eunuch Eutropius, who had ruled the Emperor Arcadius, she pursued Chrysostom with unceasing enmity. It must be admitted that he was not tactful. He alluded to her in a sermon as Jezebel, and afterwards, on account of his violent dislike of a silver statue on a marble column which had been set up in her honour near the church, and around which unseemly dancing and revelry took place, he is said to have spoken of Herodias "again dancing, and demanding the head of John." But the Empress had to proceed cautiously. She employed Theophilus of Alexandria, Chrysostom's enemy, to stir up feeling against him on the ground that he had interfered in some churches of Asia not within his jurisdiction. Chrysostom had acted, as often, with more righteous zeal than prudence. A carefully selected council of bishops, held in 403, decreed his condemnation and exile by the Emperor's orders.

The place of exile was Cucusus in Lesser Armenia, a desolate and dangerous spot. Here Chrysostom

spent what Gibbon calls "the three most glorious years of his life," exercising by correspondence a pastoral care over many of the churches of the East. But Eudoxia was not satisfied. She ordered him to be removed to a still more remote and inhospitable place on the north-east shore of the Black Sea. The journey thither, deliberately made hard, was too much for an old and feeble man, and he died near Comana, in the sixtieth year of his age, his last words being "Glory be to God for all things."

Numerous writings of Chrysostom remain, treatises, commentaries, letters, and sermons. His fame rests chiefly on his preaching, which was vivid and dramatic with, as Gibbon says, "an inexhaustible fund of metaphors and similitudes, of ideas and images, to vary and illustrate the most familiar topics."

BOOKS

Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Vols. "Ambrose," "Augustine," "Jerome," "Chrysostom."

Murray's *Dictionary of Christian Biography.* Articles on "Ambrose," etc.

Augustine: *Confessions.* Translation by C. Bigg.

CHAPTER XIII

MONASTICISM

I

Early Asceticism.—The earliest Church, as we read of it in the New Testament, was a community of the saints, the holy people of God. A high standard was expected of all, though not always reached. This standard, strict as it was, was yet a natural one, and marriage was held in honour. Even where St Paul asserts his preference for the unmarried state, he is careful not to press it unduly on others. Nevertheless, there existed almost from the first a feeling of veneration for virgins who, while they remained at home and engaged in ordinary duties, refused marriage in order to serve God more devotedly. Here was the beginning of a double standard of life, which became more apparent in the second and third centuries, when numbers entered the Church who were unable to reach the high standard of the first days. Insensibly the Church changed from a community of saints into an agency for salvation, and ardent and heroic souls could not rest satisfied with what was expected of the ordinary believer.

Origen and Tertullian distinguished between the Gospel commands, which were obligatory on all, and the precepts, which were for the few. The

distinction was based upon St Matthew xix. 11–12, and concerned mainly abstinence from marriage; but a voluntary renunciation of property was also highly esteemed. The clergy were naturally expected to reach the highest level. In the New Testament a second marriage is forbidden them,[1] and by the third century it was widely accepted that no priest should marry after ordination. This ideal was, however, practically realised only to a very limited extent. The ascetic tendency, in clergy and laity alike, was increased by the low state of pagan morality and amusement, against which it seemed necessary to make a protest; but without question it was partly due to a perverted notion of the depravity of human life, which finds no support in the teaching of Jesus. It provided an outlet for the enthusiastic devotion of many, and we may conjecture that, in times of danger, it was these resolute and uncompromising Christians who were the first to suffer martyrdom.

After the Decian and Valerian persecutions the Church enjoyed a period of forty years' unbroken peace. The stimulus of martyrdom was taken away, probably, as men must have thought, for ever. There was little scope for heroism, since organised missionary work or social and philanthropic activity had not yet come into the consciousness of the Church. It was at this time that the ascetics, who had hitherto lived in their homes, began to fly from the world to lead a solitary life in the desert. They were not clergy, but ordinary laymen, possessed with a desire to exceed the demands of conventional religion. Antony, born in Upper Egypt about 250,

[1] 1 Tim. iii. 2.

of native Coptic and Greek stock, was the pioneer. He retired to the desert, fasted and prayed, underwent almost incredible hardships in his merciless self-discipline, and was soon followed by multitudes of like-minded men, who lived separately or in small groups. Pachomius, born in 292, made a new departure by organising a community, each member of which lived in his own cell, but had some share in a common life, with rules for work, worship and obedience to a superior. He also established a similar community for women. This was a better type of life, allowing at least for some human companionship; and when Pachomius died in 346 there were ten of his communities existing in Egypt.

II

The Rule of St Basil.—The next development was due to Basil the Great, Bishop of Cæsarea (born 329; died 379).[1] He visited Egypt in 357–8, and resolved to gather together the unorganised ascetic life of Asia Minor into communities like those of Pachomius. Basil's work was the beginning of Monasticism proper, although the word monk (*monachos*, solitary one, hermit) is a survival of the earlier stages. Close to his family home, on the banks of the Iris in Cappadocia, he established his community. On the opposite bank of the river his sister Macrina formed a similar society for women. This seems to have developed later into a double monastery, the men's part presided over by Peter, a younger brother of Macrina. Yet another brother

[1] See p. 80.

in this remarkable family was Gregory of Nyssa. He paid a visit to his sister shortly before her death, and has left us a touching description of her character and work in his *Life of St Macrina*.[1]

The rule of St Basil provides for a common life in which prayer and manual labour take the foremost place. He assigns to prayer the hours which were afterwards universally adopted, and considers the cultivation of the ground the most suitable labour for a monk. But other work was also undertaken. Children were received into the monastery, and taught the Scriptures. They were not, however, to be admitted as members till they were old enough to understand what it meant. Basil also established, about 375, in Cæsarea a hospital for the care of the sick. Shortly before this, Ephraim had formed a hospital at Edessa in Syria with alms entrusted to him by the rich. These two share the honour of being the earliest Christian hospitals on record.

III

St Benedict.—The monastic system, based on Basil's rule, spread rapidly through Asia Minor and beyond. Towards the end of the fourth century it received the vehement support of Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine. It was introduced into the West by Athanasius during his exile. He was an enthusiastic advocate of asceticism, and wrote a life of St Antony. There is no mention of monk or nun or ascetic in the Catacombs or in the early

[1] English Translation by W. K. Lowther Clarke (Early Church Classics, S.P.C.K.)

Western records, but such existed in the fourth century and formed in various places a nucleus round which the Eastern movement could grow. Martin of Tours established a monastery in 362. This example was followed in other cathedral cities, and gradually the cathedral clergy were forced to adopt the monastic life. Hitherto monks had been chiefly laymen; the custom that priests should become monks originated in the cathedral chapters.

These sporadic movements in the West received a new impetus, and were placed on a definite and uniform foundation in consequence of the rule made by Benedict of Nursia (480–542). After living as a hermit, Benedict gathered round him a number of disciples and formed his rule for their common life. The influence of Basil is clearly discernible. According to Benedict, worship is the monk's first duty. After worship comes work, which may be manual or intellectual. A Benedictine monastery was self-contained, a small city, in which the various members provided by their different labours for every need of the community. The rule, though severe, was not beyond the capacity of one who was in earnest. It avoided the extravagances which were common in the East, and was typically Roman in its moderation and justice. So admirably did it meet the needs of the West that by 800 it was almost universally adopted. In the Dark and Middle Ages the monastery was the only refuge for quiet and studious men. Only within its walls were books preserved and education and the arts fostered. The weakness of the system was that it took the best men and women from a world in which they were badly needed, and disparaged family life.

The Christianity brought into England by Augustine in 597 was monastic in character. Indeed the period from this date to the Norman Conquest in England is one of the finest in monastic history. Monasteries were established everywhere, and the names of Aidan, Wilfred, Theodore, Cuthbert, Boniface, Bede, Alcuin, Dunstan, with the women Hilda and Etheldreda, are enough to show how fine a work the system accomplished in England. It was the monks who converted Saxon England, though the parish clergy were for the most part married.

BOOKS

Palladius: *The Lausiac History*. Translated by W. K. Lowther Clarke. S.P.C.K. 5s.

W. H. Mackean: *Christian Monasticism in Egypt to the Close of the Fourth Century*. S.P.C.K. 8s.

H. B. Workman: *The Evolution of the Monastic Ideal*. Epworth Press. 5s.

CHAPTER XIV

ISLAM

I

Life and Character of Muhammad. — The word Islam means resignation or obedience, primarily to the five duties on which the Muslim religion is based; belief in God and His prophet, prescribed prayers, a tax called "alms," observance of the fast Ramadan and the pilgrimage to Mecca.

Muhammad was born about 570 at Mecca in Arabia, a part of the world which had remained almost untouched by the civilisation of Greece and Rome. Of his birth and early life not much can be said with certainty. At twenty-five he appears to have married a rich woman, older than himself. He was forty before the first of his revelations came to him. In a holy cave near Mecca, whither he had retired for meditation, Gabriel appeared and addressed him as a prophet of God. After a short period of incredulity Muhammad accepted his mission, and his wife became his first convert. He aspired to the position of prophet and leader, first of his own family, and then of his tribe. But the established priesthood of Mecca opposed him, and he was in danger of his life. The people of Medina, whose city was disturbed by civil war, then invited him to settle among them and heal

their disputes. Accompanied by a military guard of his followers he escaped to Medina and began to organise an army. "If we are slain in your cause," the men of Medina are reported to have asked him, "what is our reward?" "Paradise," replied the prophet.

Muhammad thus established himself as a military adventurer. He ruthlessly suppressed all sedition in Medina. To the Jews, who were powerful there, he was at first friendly. His professed object was to restore the monotheistic religion of Abraham, ancestor of Jews and Christians alike. He even contemplated making Jerusalem the centre of his new religion. When the Jews rejected his advances, he attacked and conquered their communities in Arabia and became strong enough to war with Mecca itself, which he captured eight years after his flight and eighteen years after his call. This was in 630. The idols of the Kaaba, or sanctuary of Mecca, said to have been 360 in number, were destroyed, but the sacred Black Stone was preserved, and the custom of kissing it was retained.

Thenceforward Muhammadanism proceeds as a movement of the Arabian people for world conquest. Muhammad was essentially a soldier, and only when he obtained a strong military following did his movement spread. Nevertheless, the adoption of the monotheistic creed was of great assistance as a war-cry and a bond of unity among his followers. It enabled him also to proclaim, as having the definite sanction of God, the series of prophetic oracles and legal ordinances which were afterwards compiled to form the Koran.

II

Nature and Extension of Islam.—Towards Christians, as towards Jews, Muhammad seems at one time to have entertained feelings of friendliness and toleration. But soon these gave place to implacable hostility. Muhammad was no speculative thinker. The unity of God was to him a purely practical doctrine. Consequently he had no power to understand Christian teaching about the Trinity, and supposed that Christians worshipped three deities, Allah, the Virgin Mary, and the Spirit or Word. The fact is, that his system was in all respects a reaction; theologically, to Judaism, and ethically, to a primitive and almost savage form of society. Extermination or slavery are the fate of those who oppose the sword of the prophet. Women lose entirely that elevated status which the religion of Christ was slowly granting them. According to the Koran, a man may have four wives, besides slave women and war captives. Muhammad himself exceeded his own limit, but by a special divine dispensation. It was natural that, as his movement extended, it should find in Christianity its greatest enemy. We must, however, acknowledge that the form of Christianity with which it first came into contact, in Egypt, Palestine and Syria, was not a healthy one. The churches in these lands were worn out with fruitless controversy, and so torn by internal dissensions that they could not unite to strike a blow for their faith.

The dream of world conquest was not realised during the lifetime of Muhammad. He brought the Arabian people into unity, and gave them a faith.

But he was approaching old age when he re-entered Mecca, and though he sent embassies to the King of Persia and to Heraclius, the Roman Emperor at Constantinople, inviting them to become Muslims, the actual work of conquest was left to his successors. First Syria fell after two battles and a few sieges, Jerusalem being taken in 636. The Arabs became convinced of their invincibility, and imposed degrading terms on their Christian subjects. Then, in a period of less than twenty years, Persia was subdued, the conquest being complete by 651. Egypt was divided between the native Copts, who were Monophysites, and the Greek population, who were orthodox. The former welcomed the invaders, who were thus enabled to master the whole country in three years. From Egypt the armies travelled westward, slowly but relentlessly, till by 705 the whole of North Africa was in their power. Early in the eighth century they were in possession of the larger part of Spain. In Persia practically the whole population had become Muslim. In North Africa Christianity continued to exist for a time, but at last disappeared. In Egypt and Syria the Muslim population must have greatly increased by conversions and by the results of mixed marriages. Consequently in the place of the old Christian provinces new Muslim nations began to come into existence.

This victorious expansion came to an end in the West in 732, when Charles Martel, King of the Franks, defeated the Muslims at the battle of Tours. In the East, Constantinople was able to hold its own and to prevent further extensions of the Muslim power until the eleventh century. Thus Christendom was saved. Islam, relieved from the necessity of

further conquests, developed a remarkable civilisation in architecture, science and letters, which found its centres in Bagdad, Damascus, Cairo, Seville and other cities.

III

Results of Islam: Iconoclasm.—"Christianity," says Milman, "had subdued the world by peace; she could only defend it by war."[1] Secular power had before this been used by Christianity to repress heretics, but a religious war had been unknown. Now, however, it was seen that the attack of Islam must be met by a military counter-attack, the motive of which was the defence of the faith. The Christian East had gone down at the first onset, and surrendered the holy places to the infidel, because it had lost its nerve and manliness. It needed the fierce courage of the Northern barbarians to repel the invaders when half-way through Gaul. Henceforth the soldier of the Cross, the knight of mediæval chivalry, is a natural figure in Christian thought; and a Pope can summon Europe to a Crusade to drive the enemies of that Cross from Jerusalem. This idea of defending Christianity by the sword would have been unintelligible in the early centuries. The Church was driven to it by the menace of Islam, which was, as it still remains, the most formidable challenge to the Christian purpose of ultimate world domination.

An event closely connected with the rise of Islam is the Iconoclastic controversy of the eighth and ninth centuries. After the shock of the Muslim

[1] *History of Latin Christianity*, IV. ch. ii.

conquests Leo III (716–741), the first of the Isaurian dynasty of emperors, endeavoured to consolidate what remained of the Eastern Empire. He felt that the cult of images, which had gone to extreme lengths in the East, was a hindrance to the conversion of Jews and Muslims. It was also a weakness to the Church, for it opened a door to much superstition. Edicts were therefore issued commanding the destruction of all images in churches, and much resistance and persecution followed, especially among the monastic orders, which were greatly given to this kind of devotion. Appeals were made to Rome, and Gregory II defended the veneration of images. Leo, however, continued his policy, claiming, in the manner of the Greek emperors, that he was both King and Priest, and so authorised to legislate for the Church. His power did not reach beyond Sicily, and Italy disregarded the edicts. The persecution was continued by Leo's son, Constantine V, and in 753 a Synod of 338 members met at Constantinople and declared images to be forbidden by Exod. xx. 4–5; Deut. v. 8–9; St John iv. 24; Rom. i. 22–25, etc. As the movement appears to have been almost entirely a government one, supported by no popular demand, it is clear that the decision of this Synod was made under the influence of the Emperor. No representatives of Rome, Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem had been present. The three last-named were under the dominion of Islam, and, like Rome, beyond the Emperor's power. The decrees of the Synod were effective, therefore, in a comparatively small area only.

So drastic a change in Christian habits of worship was bound to be followed by a reaction. After the

death of Leo IV in 780, his widow Irene became Regent for her son Constantine VI (780–797), a boy of nine. She took steps to re-establish the cult of images, first deposing the iconoclast Patriarch of Constantinople, Paul IV, in favour of an image-worshipper Tarasius; and then renewing relations with Rome, which had been broken in consequence of the iconoclastic movement. A Synod was held at Nicæa in 787, which declared that images are worthy of veneration, but not of adoration, the honour given to them passing on to the being whom they represent. A further reaction to iconoclasm took place twenty-eight years later, and was successful for a time; but again the images were restored by a woman, the Empress Theodora, in 842. After this the controversy ended, so far as the East was concerned.

The reasons given for the veneration of images are practically the same as those by which pagan teachers, such as Dion Chrysostom at the end of the first century, had defended the Greek statues, so fiercely assailed by the early Fathers. It is noticeable, however, that in the East the images in question are either pictures or carvings in relief or mosaic work. They were hung or painted on the walls of churches. Eastern Church feeling was then, as it still is, repugnant to solid statuary. The Western Church saw no religious distinction between these two forms of art.

BOOKS

D. S. Margoliouth: *Mohammed and the Rise of Islam*. Putnam. 7s. 6d.

Cambridge Mediæval History, Vol. II. chs. x.-xii.

CHAPTER XV

THE PAPACY TO THE GREAT SCHISM 1054

I

Early Roman Claims.—It was inevitable that Rome, as the centre of the Empire, should be from the first a place of great importance in Christian history. Men turned naturally thither, in Church as in civil affairs, for the settlement of disputes. The Roman bishops, on their part, were as a rule wise and capable leaders, whose judgments generally proved acceptable to the whole Church. They were fully conscious of their dignity, and an authoritative tone is observable in them from early times. They were, however, vigorously resisted on occasion, particularly by Cyprian, who, while conceding a primacy to the Bishop of Rome, contended that Church government depended on the collective action of all bishops, who were in theory equal. The Petrine text, St Matt. xvi. 18–19, and the story of St Peter's twenty-five years' episcopate in Rome, were not the cause of the Roman supremacy, but reasons afterwards brought forward to justify it. The true cause was the position and history of Rome itself.

In 330 the seat of government was removed to Constantinople. This act weakened imperial control in the West and made the Bishop of Rome more important than ever. When the Huns, Vandals, and

Goths invaded Italy it was the Popes and not the Emperors who resisted them or treated with them. The Council of Chalcedon in 451 placed Rome and Constantinople on an equality in ecclesiastical matters. Leo the Great at once protested, asserting the primacy of St Peter among the Apostles and the transmission of his authority to his successors at Rome. In 492 Gelasius, writing to the Emperor Anastasius, informs him that the world is ruled by two powers, that of the Emperor and that of the Pope; and he treats with haughty contempt the idea that any other bishop could have independent rights as against Rome. Italy was then under the Goths, and when in the sixth century Justinian reconquered it, the Papal prestige declined. But the next barbarian attack, that of the Lombards, brought to the front a strong Pope, Gregory the Great (590–604), who withstood them, and exercised in Italy a power greater than that of the Emperor. Gregory not only asserted, in terms even more definite, if possible, the claims previously made by Leo and Gelasius, but put them into active operation. He interfered in Church matters in Ravenna, Illyria, Gaul and Spain, and sent his famous mission to Britain. This mission, together with the evangelisation of Germany by Boniface, brought further power to the Papacy, since the new churches were established in close connexion with Rome and under her authority.

II

The Popes and the Frankish Kings.—When the Iconoclastic controversy arose in the East the Pope,

as we have seen,[1] opposed the Iconoclasts and disregarded the imperial edicts. The Emperor replied by removing Sicily and South Italy from the Papal jurisdiction; Rome and Northern Italy he was unable to touch. Nevertheless, the Pope's position was none too strong. The Lombards were threatening from the north, and Rome felt the need of support. In this emergency Pope Zacharias turned to the Franks. Clovis the Frankish king had become an orthodox Catholic in 496, shortly after his marriage with Clotilda.[2] With him began what is called the Merovingian line. The later kings of this line dwindled into insignificance, being kept in strict seclusion and deprived of all real power, which fell into the hands of certain officials called the "mayors of the palace." Of these, one Pippin became supreme in 687. He was succeeded by his son Charles Martel, who repulsed the Muhammadan invasion at Tours in 732. Pippin the Short, the son of Charles, was anxious to regularise his position as ruler of the Franks. Accordingly Zacharias allowed the Archbishop of Maintz to anoint him king in 752, while the feeble Childeric retired into a monastery. Pippin marched into Italy, drove off the Lombards, who were then threatening Rome itself, and granted the recovered territories to the Pope. Pippin's only right to these lands was that of conquest. They formed part of the Empire, but the Emperor was powerless. Thus came into existence the "States of the Church," in reality the territorial possessions of the Bishop of Rome, who became henceforth a secular prince as well as a spiritual ruler.

Pippin left two sons, Carloman and Charles, but

[1] See pp. 113-114.

[2] See pp. 81-82.

the former soon died, and Charles, known to history as Charles the Great or Charlemagne, seized all his brother's dominions. He defeated the Lombard king Desiderius, who had attempted to recover the lands given to the Pope, and made a fresh donation of these lands to Hadrian I. Under Charles' protection the Church of Rome increased in wealth and outward magnificence. The revenues of the Papal States gave the Popes a position they had never held before, and made their office an object of ambition which unworthy men not seldom attempted to secure through treachery and crime. It was left to Hadrian's successor, Leo III, to express in the most unequivocal way possible the heights to which the Papacy aspired. On Christmas Day 800 Charles was in Rome and attended Mass with his Court and many of the nobles, clergy, and people. At the close of the service Leo advanced towards Charles, placed a crown upon his head, and proclaimed him Cæsar Augustus, amid the cheering of the assembled multitude. Whether Charles knew Leo's intentions beforehand is not certain; but he accepted the honour, which enabled him to consolidate his power over a large part of Western Europe. This was the real beginning of the "Holy Roman Empire," which claimed to be a continuation of the old Empire under barbarian rulers in communion with Christian Rome. From it arose the theory universally accepted in the West during the Middle Ages, that there were two twin rulers, the Emperor for secular and the Pope for spiritual purposes. The crowning of Charles, however, gave the impression that the secular power depended upon the spiritual; and it was the basis of the later Papal claims to make and unmake kings.

III

Growth of Papal Power. The Great Schism.— Charlemagne's great Empire was held together largely by his personality. At his death a period of anarchy ensued. Danes and Northmen invaded Germany, Northern France and Britain, and the Feudal System grew up, probably from the willingness of weaker men to secure the protection of stronger ones in return for a definite personal service. With the decline in the imperial power came an increase in that of the Papacy. Nicholas I (858–867) declared that the Church was superior to every earthly authority, and in the Church the Pope was absolute ruler, the bishops being his agents. In two well-known cases this Pope used his power in a cause undoubtedly righteous. Lothar II, King of Lorraine, had divorced his innocent wife Theutberga, and had obtained the support of the Archbishops of Cologne and Treves for his action. Nicholas interfered on her behalf, and after a long struggle succeeded in humiliating both the King and the Archbishops. In the East the Emperor Michael III was under the power of his uncle Bardas, a man of low character. Ignatius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, refused the Sacrament to Bardas, and was deposed, Photius, a learned layman, being made patriarch in his place within a week. Ignatius, exiled and persecuted, appealed to Nicholas, who excommunicated the new patriarch, and was excommunicated by him in return. Photius accused the Roman Church of heresy for adding the *filioque* clause to the Creed, demanding celibacy

of the clergy and confining Confirmation to bishops. Nicholas was clearly in the right in supporting Ignatius; nevertheless, his efforts in this case were unsuccessful.

At this time were issued what are known as the False Decretals. These were forged additions to the collection of genuine letters or edicts of Popes, dating from the end of the fourth century. The new ones carried the series back to the time of Clement (95), and they included the so-called Donation of Constantine, by which this Emperor was alleged to have given the Popes the overlordship of Italy and the West. The object of the forged documents, which were assumed to be genuine by Nicholas I, was to provide early sanction for the extravagant claims of the later Popes. They contain glaring historical errors, but were universally accepted till 1440.

After a century of confusion the Empire entered upon a period of restoration, first under Henry the Fowler (916–936), and then under his greater son Otto I (936–973). Otto's Church policy was to make the German bishops lay rulers as well as spiritual. The bishops were nobles, and the imperial power was thus bound up with the appointments to ecclesiastical office. Otto invaded Italy, made himself master of it, and was crowned in Rome by John XII in 962. By a compact with the Pope he agreed to support the Church and to maintain its rights and privileges, while the Pope and people acknowledged him as their sovereign. The Church was now secure, but its spiritual condition was weak, and the able rulers which the times demanded were not forthcoming. John XII was unsatisfactory

and was deposed. Some of his successors were men of the lowest character. Offices were openly bought and sold, including the Papacy itself. In 1044 there were three rival Popes in Rome. Finally, Henry III, successor to the Ottos, intervened and appointed Popes himself; and so bad was the situation that no protest was raised.

Henry's nominees were Germans, who it was hoped would bring a new spirit into the decadent Church. Two died in a short space; but the third, Bruno, Bishop of Toul, a cousin of the Emperor, became Pope in 1049 under the title of Leo IX and accomplished a remarkable work in a few years. He found St Peter's dilapidated, and the Papal revenues exhausted. By patience and economy he restored the Cathedral, and then proceeded to attack what were regarded as the two greatest Church scandals, simony, or the acquisition of benefices for money, and clerical marriage. In this work he was aided by a subdeacon Hildebrand, who had come with him from Germany. Leo made journeys to France and Germany, calling bishops to Synods, deposing men who were guilty of grave crimes, and enforcing Papal authority everywhere.

In South Italy Leo was less successful. Many churches there still paid allegiance to Constantinople. These Leo attempted to bring within his jurisdiction, with the result that the patriarch, Michael Cerularius, closed all the churches in Constantinople that used the Latin rite. The theological issue between East and West turned mainly on the *filioque* clause, which the West had added to the Creed, and on the use of unleavened

bread in the Eucharist, a custom to which the East strongly objected. In 1054 Leo took the drastic step of sending messengers to Constantinople with a letter excommunicating Michael and all his followers. This was laid on the high altar of St Sophia, and completed the breach between East and West. Meanwhile, Leo had in person led an armed force against the Normans, who were powerful in South Italy. He was defeated and made prisoner, held in captivity for some months, and then allowed to return to Rome, where he died almost immediately.

BOOKS

M. Deanesly: *A History of the Mediæval Church.*

F. J. Foakes Jackson: *An Introduction to the History of Christianity*, A.D. 590-1314. Macmillan. 20s.

[These two books are useful also for Chapters XVI-XXI.]

L. Duchesne (translated by A. H. Mathew): *The Beginnings of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes.* Thomas Baker. 6s.

CHAPTER XVI

THE PAPACY FROM 1054 TO THE CONCORDAT OF WORMS, 1122

I

Consolidation of the Papal Position.—On the death of Leo IX the Emperor Henry III appointed another German Pope, Victor II. The clergy, desirous of reform, had been glad to accept the Emperor's help, but they disliked his domination. In 1056 Henry died, and there appeared a chance of delivering the Church from imperial control; for his son, Henry IV, was but a boy of six. Victor's position was exceedingly strong. He had been a close adviser of Henry III, and he was now almost Emperor as well as Pope. But he too died suddenly the next year, and the Romans, led by the reform clergy, at once chose as the new Pope Frederick of Lorraine, an enemy of the imperial house. He took the title of Stephen IX, but died soon after his appointment. Trouble then arose between the Roman nobles, who were bent on plundering the Church, and the reform clergy, led by Cardinal Humbert and Hildebrand. The nobles elected Benedict X, but the reform clergy gained the favour of the Empress, who empowered them to declare the election void. The nobles retired and left

Benedict to his fate. He was deposed and degraded, and Nicholas II was elected in his place.

The problem that faced the Papacy was how to maintain its high pretensions without military support. Either it must fall under the control of the Empire or else become subservient to the Roman nobles. Nicholas sought other allies. The Normans were now almost undisputed masters of Southern Italy. Nicholas recognised their sovereignty in return for their promise of armed help when necessary. Thus supported, he was able to convene the Second Lateran Council at Rome in 1059, at which arrangements were made for future Papal elections. The Cardinal bishops were to choose, and then consult the Cardinal priests and deacons. These were the higher clergy of Rome and its neighbourhood. It was hoped by this plan to exclude the influence of the nobility. As for the Emperor, it was expected that he would give his approval of the Pope so elected. The result of all this was to make the Papacy in effect an Italian institution, dependent upon the Roman clergy. The German prelates, who were feudal barons owing allegiance to the Emperor, were naturally opposed to it.

Nicholas died in 1061 and a new Pope, Alexander II, was elected by the reform party. In spite of the opposition of the German prelates, who desired an imperial election, Alexander made good his position. It was he who gave his sanction to William the Norman to conquer England. By this time, however, Henry IV had come of age. He proved a strong ruler and was soon engaged in a dispute with the Pope over the appointment of an Archbishop of Milan. Alexander carried the matter to the

length of excommunicating, not Henry but his advisers, and then died.

II

Hildebrand and Henry IV.—For long the controlling hand behind the Papacy had been Hildebrand. Now he was elected Pope (1073) by sudden popular acclamation as he was conducting the funeral service for Alexander. He took the title of Gregory VII. In him the Papacy made its highest claims. It was a divinely appointed sovereignty, having power to direct kingdoms not only spiritually but in temporal matters also. If rulers opposed its decrees, it could absolve their subjects from the loyalty due to them and transfer their dominion to others. Hildebrand pressed these claims to the utmost. He made a determined attack upon lay investiture, or the appointment of clergy to benefices by laymen in return for money or other considerations, and upon clerical marriage. In the first he was attacking the Emperor, who, as feudal superior, appointed prelates and received their homage; in the second, a large proportion of the clergy of all ranks. Henry was for a time disposed to acquiesce in the degradation of the lower clergy, especially since he was engaged in suppressing a rebellion in Saxony. But when he saw that the Papal demands meant an absolute subordination of the Empire to the Church, he resisted. As a result, in 1076 he was excommunicated and his subjects released from their allegiance. The effect was serious. Many barons were only too ready to seize an excuse for rebellion, while in

all classes there was a superstitious dread of taking the side of one who lay under the censure of God's representative on earth. Henry felt the Empire slipping away from him.

In his desperation he determined to submit. With a few followers he crossed the Alps in the middle of a hard winter. Hildebrand, uncertain whether the King was coming as a suppliant or a warrior, took refuge in the castle of Matilda of Tuscany, a strong supporter of the Papacy, at Canossa. There for three days Henry stood barefoot, lightly clad and fasting, in the snow outside the castle gates. Finally Hildebrand was prevailed upon to admit him and, after extracting many humiliating promises, to grant him absolution. This dramatic scene marks the highest point reached by the Papal power.

But Henry's rebellious nobles, encouraged as they had been by the Pope, had gone too far to turn back. A disastrous civil war in Germany followed. Rudolf of Swabia was elected as Emperor. The Pope could disown neither Henry nor Rudolf, and he contented himself with demanding that strife should cease and the matter be referred to him for final decision. But gradually Henry's cause became stronger. Then Hildebrand, anxious lest the claimant whom his action had incited to rebellion should fail, openly supported Rudolf and a second time excommunicated Henry. This time, however, the weapon failed. Henry determined to crush Hildebrand. In 1084 he besieged and captured Rome, the Pope retiring into the castle of St Angelo. A Norman army came to his rescue, and Henry was forced to retreat. But the excesses of the Normans,

who when once within the city pillaged and burnt and murdered indiscriminately, made it necessary for Hildebrand to leave Rome. He went to the Norman castle at Salerno, where soon afterwards he died, in sorrow and disappointment, but with a spirit proud and relentless to the last.

III

Events leading to the Concordat of Worms.—Henry had appointed an anti-pope, Clement III, who at the time of Hildebrand's death was in possession of part of Rome. The Church party, after many efforts, succeeded in persuading the Abbot of Monte Casino to accept the pontificate as Victor III. Victor, however, died in 1087 and Urban II was elected in his place. There were thus two Popes in Rome. The position of Urban, whose rival had the Emperor's support, was at first precarious, but several causes combined to assist him. First, his own conduct which, though firm, was less provocative than that of Hildebrand. Then Conrad, the elder and favourite son of Henry, revolted, and was acknowledged by Urban. But the greatest event in Urban's pontificate was the inauguration of the Crusades. The sufferings that pilgrims visiting the holy places in Palestine endured at the hands of the Turks, had aroused the wrath of Christian Europe. At the Council of Clermont (1095) Urban appealed for a Crusade to rescue Jerusalem from the infidel. So great was the enthusiasm that the Papacy which, as representative of Christendom, naturally took the lead in this enterprise, gained enormous prestige.

Jerusalem was captured by Godfrey in 1099, but Urban had died before the news reached Rome.

The succeeding Pope, Paschal II, continued the strife with Henry IV, who was still under excommunication. The Emperor's last days were sad. A second rebellion, this time of his younger son Henry, weakened his power and crushed his spirit. He was forced to abdicate, and died in 1106. Paschal had supported the young Henry's rebellion, as Urban had that of Conrad. But when the successful rebel began to reign as Henry V he proved an even more determined enemy than his father. He invaded Italy, took prisoner the Pope and Cardinals, and finally in 1511 extracted from the weakened Paschal a treaty by which the investiture of bishops and abbots with ring and staff was retained by the Emperor. This gave away all that preceding Popes had fought for. So intense was the opposition it caused in the Church that Paschal was compelled a few years after to forswear his oath. Henry again invaded Rome and Paschal retired. In 1118 he died.

It was becoming evident that a compromise must be reached in this dispute. Calixtus II, a French Pope, elected in 1119, while maintaining the Papal position as firmly as ever, yet showed himself not unwilling to make peace. In 1107 Anselm had arranged for England a settlement of the same question, which had worked satisfactorily. Bishops and abbots did homage to the king for their lands, but received their ring and staff, the signs of their spiritual office, from the Church. A similar settlement was made for the Continent at Worms in 1122. Elections were to be held in the presence of the

Emperor or his representatives, although the actual appointments were made by the Church. In cases of dispute the Emperor promised to consult with the Metropolitan and other bishops of the province. He gave up the right of presenting the ring and staff, but retained the right of investing the prelate with his temporal possessions. This settlement was ratified by the Church at the First Lateran Council held in the following year.

We may wonder why a quarrel susceptible of so easy a settlement should have continued so long and wrought such disaster to Christendom. The fact was that each party was seeking to dominate the other. The Emperors would have reduced the Church to utter subservience. The Church, on the other hand, would on the principles of Hildebrand have become in reality secular as well as spiritual ruler. The Concordat of Worms marks the point at which these two powers acquiesced for a time in a condition of equality.

BOOKS

D. J. Medley: *The Church and the Empire.*
Cambridge Mediæval History, Vol. V.
W. R. W. Stephens: *Hildebrand and His Times.*

CHAPTER XVII

THE CRUSADES

I

Causes of the Crusades.—The Crusades are best understood as one phase of the contest between Christianity and Islam. The victorious progress of Islam in the West had been checked by Charles Martel in 732, and in the East Constantinople presented a firm barrier for seven centuries more. But the Greek Empire had degenerated. The Iconoclastic controversy had weakened it; and a bad land system had resulted in large tracts of Asia Minor being tilled by serfs, while the landlords were either absentees living in Constantinople or ecclesiastical corporations exempt from military service. Hence there was no adequate defence against aggressors.

Towards the end of the eleventh century the Seljuk Turks, migrating from Central Asia, conquered the Arabs and became the dominant Muhammadan people. They had all the fanaticism of their predecessors without their culture. They continued their conquests from Jerusalem through Asia Minor and came close to Constantinople itself. The Emperor Michael VII (1067–1078) asked Hildebrand for help, which might have been sent but for the Investiture dispute. Later, Alexius I appealed

to Urban II for similar help. But when Urban called the Crusade at Clermont in 1095 he enlarged its scope. The object was not simply to help the Greeks but to recover the holy places.

Pilgrimages to holy places were a common form of mediæval devotion, and Jerusalem was naturally the most sacred spot of all. The Muhammadan conquest had not seriously affected the pilgrims. But the coming of the Turks brought changes. Fines and exactions were levied and cruelties practised, the stories of which caused deep anger when reported in Europe. Moreover, the state of Europe was favourable to some fresh military movement. The Muhammadans had been driven from Sicily by the Normans (1060–1091), and earlier than this Ferdinand I had reconquered some parts of Spain long held by the Moors. The former barbarians of Northern and Central Europe had become Christians and were now assimilated to the civilisation of the Western Empire. To feudal nobles peace meant sheer inactivity and was an intolerable condition of life. The prospect of an adventurous march to the East, with plunder and wealth at the end, was to many a relief rather than a burden.

The Popes used this spirit, partly for religious reasons and partly to increase their own power. Strong and hostile princes were rendered powerless by being persuaded to go on a Crusade. They might be killed, and not a few were. Even if they returned, it was with diminished strength and prestige. Lesser men were attracted by the spiritual advantages offered. A plenary indulgence, involving the forgiveness of all sins whatsoever, was offered to all who wore the cross. Those who died were

sure of heaven. The Pope undertook the guardianship of their families, and forbade creditors to sue them for debts or to exact usury. Many, no doubt, went for the express purpose of escaping financial or other embarrassments.

II

The First Crusade and the Kingdom of Jerusalem.—Urban's appeal in 1095 produced an instant response. Peter the Hermit, an emotional preacher, though not, as was formerly supposed, the initiator of the movement, greatly aided it by his sermons. The result was that in 1096 a wild, undisciplined rabble set out to reach the Holy Land. Other leaders besides Peter were Walter the Penniless, a French knight, and Gottschalk, a priest. Some of these proceeded peacefully, but others began to plunder and murder Jews in the Rhine cities and at Ratisbon. When their deeds became known they were not welcomed in Hungary and the Balkans, and many perished. Those who reached Constantinople were courteously received by Alexius and conveyed across to Asia Minor. They were advised to wait for reinforcements, but ventured on a rash attack and were utterly beaten. Most of their leaders were killed and the survivors of the host dispersed.

A more serious attempt was made by a number of French and Norman nobles. Hugh of Vermandois, brother of the King of France, Robert of Normandy, son of the Conqueror, Bohemond, the Norman ruler of Taranto and his nephew Tancred, Godfrey of Bouillon, with his brothers Baldwin and Eustace,

and Raymond, Count of Toulouse, were the chief leaders. Alexius promised to help them, but made them swear to hold whatever lands they conquered as his feudal vassals. The Crusaders took Nicæa, defeated the Turks at Dorylæum, and after some difficulty captured Antioch. A relief force under Karbogha of Mosul was defeated in a daring battle, for which Bohemond was placed in supreme command. The next year, 1099, Jerusalem was captured, the Muslim population mercilessly slaughtered, and Godfrey elected as Defender of the Holy Sepulchre. In the meantime Baldwin had separated himself from the main body in order to conquer Edessa. He was the first to establish a Latin kingdom in the East, and Edessa remained in Frankish hands from 1097 till 1144. Thus a Christian dominion of considerable size, including Jerusalem, Syria, Tripolis and the outpost of Edessa, was formed.

Godfrey died in 1100, and was succeeded by Baldwin. The kingdom of Jerusalem was maintained rather through the dissensions of the Muslims than the strength of its Christian possessors, who were never able to make a complete conquest of their territory. They were aided, however, by the formation of the Military Orders, which soon became their chief support. A hospital for pilgrims had been founded in Jerusalem early in the eleventh century, near the Church of St John the Baptist. In 1113 this was refounded by an order of knights, bound by monastic vows, and pledged to assist pilgrims and to care for the sick. The Knights of St John, as they were called, grew rapidly in wealth and importance. A similar order, the Knights of the Temple, was established in 1119, with a house on the site of

Solomon's temple. These orders furnished men and money to the succeeding rulers of Jerusalem. After a time they degenerated. The Templars became great land-owners, and were suppressed in France in 1307. The Knights of St John retired after the Crusades to Rhodes, which they held from 1310 to 1523, and then to Malta, where they existed till 1798.

III

Later Crusades and their Results.—When Edessa was recaptured by the Muslims in 1144, Jerusalem was placed in great danger. Thereupon a second Crusade was launched, largely through the enthusiasm of St Bernard of Clairvaux. In 1147 Louis VII of France and Conrad III of Germany each led an army to the East, but their forces met with disaster in Asia Minor. The remnants managed to reach Syria by sea and besiege Damascus. But jealousy between the Crusaders and the Franks who had already settled in Syria, brought the enterprise to utter failure.

Jerusalem held out for thirty years longer, owing mainly to the internal dissensions of the Muslims. In 1171 began the rise of Saladin, the man who was to prove the ablest leader the Muslims had yet had, and who made it the aim of his life to win back Jerusalem. By 1183 he had become master of Egypt and Damascus. The Crusaders' kingdom, thus hemmed in by a united Muslim power, fell in 1187. This disaster was deeply felt in Europe and all the great princes set out to retrieve it. Frederick Barbarossa, the Emperor, started first in 1189.

It was a serious misfortune for the Crusaders when he was accidentally drowned in Cilicia. His army reached Syria in 1190 and was soon afterwards joined by two other forces under Philip Augustus of France and Richard I of England. These leaders quarrelled, and although Acre was captured in 1191 no further progress could be made. Philip, however, returned home and Richard, who was a capable and energetic leader, beat Saladin at Arsuf, captured Jaffa and came within twelve miles of Jerusalem. But he was not strong enough to do more, and as Saladin was prepared to make peace, the two great antagonists concluded a three years' truce, by which the Christians were left with a narrow strip of coast from Ascalon to Acre, with the right of access to Jerusalem. It was an inglorious end to so great an effort.

The fourth Crusade in 1202 went overseas in order to avoid the perils of Asia Minor and the alleged treacheries of the Greeks. For a sea voyage it was necessary to hire ships from the Venetians, who alone could equip a fleet of sufficient size. The Crusades had already increased the trade of Venice with the East, in spite of the fact that Innocent III had prohibited any dealings with the infidel. A hard bargain was driven, and when the Crusaders could not pay they were forced either to give up the expedition or to serve the purposes of Venice. Thus they never reached Syria at all. The Venetians ordered them first to conquer Zara, a Hungarian seaport, and then to attack Constantinople itself on the pretext of helping a dispossessed claimant to the throne. The city was captured and pillaged, its Church changed from Greek to Latin, and a

Latin domination established, which lasted till 1261. Venice profited greatly from this curious expedition.

The ruler of the kingdom of Jerusalem, John de Brienne, appealed to Innocent III for help, and a new Crusade was proclaimed in 1216. This led to nothing but the capture and subsequent loss of Damietta in Egypt. But the Emperor Frederick II, who had married John's daughter Yolande, went to the Holy Land in 1228 and secured by treaty a partial control of Jerusalem. The city was, however, permanently lost in 1244. In 1245 Louis IX of France (St Louis) started on a sixth Crusade. Again it met with disaster in Egypt, and though Louis eventually reached Acre and remained in the Holy Land four years (1250–1254) he never saw Jerusalem. But the Christian kingdom, small as it was, was now nearing its end. In 1265 Cæsarea and Arsuf were taken, followed by Jaffa and Antioch in 1268. A final effort by Louis IX and Prince Edward of England was made in 1271. Louis died in Tunis. Edward relieved Acre and defended it for eighteen months, when he was obliged to return to England. Finally Acre was lost in 1291. This disastrous end to the hopes and sacrifices of two hundred years was due largely to the dissensions among the Christian nations and their rulers.

The Crusades undoubtedly stimulated commerce between East and West. Not only Venice, but other cities of Northern Italy grew rich in consequence. A greater result may be seen in the growth of liberty. Grants of charters were made to many towns in this period, especially in England, by kings and nobles, in return for money to pay the expenses of a Crusade. This movement is doubtless to some extent

independent of the Crusades, yet it can hardly be denied that they helped it forward. The result of travel was also to open men's minds and to assist that stirring of intellectual life which is seen in the rise of the Universities and in Scholasticism. But most of all the Crusades affected the Papacy itself. The Popes were greatly strengthened in their struggle against the Emperors by the high authority which attached to them naturally as inspirers of the Crusades. Moreover, the Indulgence, at first a purely spiritual matter, soon became a prolific source of revenue, and the imposition of Clerical Tithes, first made by the Kings of France and England, was taken over by the Papacy at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 and thereafter was constantly used to justify a Papal control over all ecclesiastical revenues. In this way the Crusades are connected even with the Reformation.

BOOKS

Cambridge Mediæval History, Vol. V. chs. vii-ix.
Sir G. W. Cox: *The Crusades.* Longmans Green. 4s.
W. B. Stevenson: *The Crusaders in the East.* Cambridge Press. 12s. 6d.

CHAPTER XVIII

MONASTIC ORDERS AND REFORMS

I

Cluny and Citeaux.—The Rule formulated by Benedict of Nursia became after two centuries the sole monastic Rule in the West. It was favoured by Gregory the Great (*c.* 540–604) and spread rapidly in France and England. Charlemagne was a zealous supporter of the Benedictine monks, whom he honoured largely for their educational work. Under his son, Louis the Pious, a German monk who took the name of Benedict of Aniane began a reform of the monasteries. He paid less attention to education and more to meditation, worship and self-denial. His strict interpretation of the Rule soon became binding on all monasteries within the Empire. A further step was taken in 910, when Duke William of Aquitaine founded the monastery of Cluny which, under a succession of able and high-minded abbots, exercised for several centuries a great influence in the Church. Cluny was a self-governing institution, free from all secular and episcopal jurisdiction, and responsible to the Pope alone. It became the parent of many other similar monasteries, the heads of which were appointed by the Abbot of Cluny. This welded the Cluniac monasteries into a compact system, which formed one of

the strongest powers in Europe. The Cluniacs supported the Papacy in its struggles against simony and clerical marriage.[1]

When the brilliance of Cluny declined in the twelfth century a new burst of monastic energy took place. The Abbey of Citeaux in the diocese of Dijon was founded in 1098. Cluny had come to favour culture, arts and letters; Citeaux went back to the utmost simplicity and severity. Cistercian monasteries were unadorned, even in architecture and ceremonial. Manual labour took the place of intellectual culture. Many of the English monasteries, such as Waverley, Tintern, Kirkstall, Fountains and Barrow, are Cistercian. Stephen Harding, the third abbot of Citeaux (1109–34), was an Englishman. Under him Bernard entered the monastery, from which he departed in 1115 to found another at Clairvaux, where he remained as abbot till his death in 1153. The attractive character and splendid gifts of Bernard did much to increase the popularity of the Cistercians. His type of piety, a genuine devotion to Christ, is one which appeals to all ages. He was a great preacher, able to move deeply all who heard him. His advice was sought by Popes and others in high position. He had a large share in organising the disastrous second Crusade.[2] In matters of thought he was bounded by his own age, having no power of understanding those who differed from him. He strenuously opposed and joined in persecuting Abélard[3] and Arnold of Brescia.[4]

[1] See Chap. XVI.
[2] See p. 134.
[3] See pp. 149-150.
[4] See pp. 160-161.

II

Heretical Movements: Cathari and Waldenses.—The history of monasticism consists of periods of enthusiasm followed by dullness and decay. There was a serious decline in the thirteenth century. In essence the monasteries were retreats into which the troubled soul could retire to ensure its own salvation. When fervour was strong, missionary labours were undertaken and the monks had some effect on the world. Afterwards this ceased and studious and serious-minded men, whom the world badly needed, were gathered into a class apart. The Church was in real danger from this cause. The secular clergy were as a rule uneducated and could not teach. Hence many heretical preachers sprang up, addressing the people in the new dialects that were gradually superseding Latin.

Two such heretical movements attained great proportions. In Southern France the Cathari, or the Pure, were a sect of Manichæan tendencies, regarding matter as essentially evil, rejecting Church and Sacraments and favouring a rigid asceticism, which in practice often degenerates into licence. The Cathari have a long history. A Manichæan sect called the Paulicians, emanating from Bulgaria and Thrace, seems to have spread or emigrated to Italy and Western Europe and to have fused with the people of Albi, a small town on the River Tarn, from which comes their other title, the Albigenses. The movement represented by these sectaries was, however, widespread and not confined to Southern France. They had a definite organisation and were

linked on to the Paulicians in Constantinople. Many rulers let them alone, as harmless if misguided men ; some even sympathised with them. But they were distinctly anti-Roman, and it is probable that, with their repudiation of marriage and other similar tenets, they were anti-social in tendency.

The other sect was the Waldenses. These take their name from Waldo, a banker of Lyons, who in 1173 renounced his property and formed a society called the Poor Men of Lyons. Their religion, though not apparently heretical, was opposed on a number of points to Church ideas and practices. The Waldenses, who exist at the present day, had their chief home in the southern slopes of the Cottian Alps, and traced their origin back beyond Waldo to primitive times. It seems that Waldo merely reinforced the movement and was not its founder. The Poor Men went about preaching, using a translation of the New Testament. They wished to reform and not to break with the Church. At the Third Lateran Council in 1179 Waldo appealed to Pope Alexander III for leave to preach, which had been refused by his Archbishop. This request was not granted, but the Poor Men refused to desist and so became separated from the Church. They were distinct from the Cathari, although both represented a spirit of freedom and of dissidence from the current conceptions of religion.

III

The Friars.—What had been forbidden to Waldo and his Poor Men was granted to Dominic, a Spaniard

born about 1170. He travelled through Southern France in 1203 when the Cathari were at the height of their power. He found the churches deserted, the clergy treated with contempt and the sectaries held in honour. Dominic felt that mission preachers as eager and self-denying as the heretics were the only answer to the dangerous situation in which the Church was placed. "Zeal must be met by zeal; humility by humility ; false sanctity by real sanctity ; preaching falsehood by preaching truth." In 1215 sympathisers presented him with a house at Toulouse, as headquarters for his work. He asked for Papal approval for a new order which he wished to found. It was at first refused, but his order was practically recognised in 1216.

Dominic's men, though bound by the old monastic rules, were essentially different from monks. The monk sought his own salvation ; the Friar the salvation of other men. With this end in view the Friar was not secluded ; his home was the world. Nor did Dominic have only the common people in mind. He sent his men to the great centres of learning, to Paris and other cities, where they might meet and influence the intellectual classes. The order grew rapidly. Its members afterwards became professors in the Universities, and some of the greatest names in mediæval theology, such as Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Eckhart and Tauler, are those of Dominicans.

Dominic himself preached with intense zeal against the heretics. But the Church was not content with this mild persuasive method. Innocent III inaugurated a "Crusade" against them and entrusted it to Simon de Montfort and any who would help

him. The Crusade was carried through with unspeakable cruelty, multitudes being slaughtered and their cities and lands laid waste. Raymond, Count of Toulouse, who had ventured to sympathise with his people, was brought to the most abject humiliation. Except for such as escaped to other lands, the Cathari were almost exterminated.

An outcome of the Crusade was the adoption of the Inquisition as a Papal Court for the suppression of heresy, at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. Plainly a slaughter of outspoken heretics will pass over many who live possibly a blameless life and yet incur suspicion by absenting themselves from Church and holding secret assemblies of their own. To formulate a definite charge against such people an inquiry is needed. The establishment of the Dominicans gave Innocent III and his successor Gregory IX the men needed to superintend a Court which could make such inquiries. It was in full working by 1229 and wielded powers, delegated from the Pope himself, far greater than those of other ecclesiastical courts.

Almost contemporary with the Dominicans are their rivals the Franciscans. Francis, a gay young man, son of a prosperous trader of Assisi, was born about 1181. After a serious illness he determined to preach repentance and the Kingdom of God in a life of the barest simplicity. Though a layman, he applied to Innocent III for permission to preach. When this was granted he formed a small society with about a dozen followers. Their title was the Penitents of Assisi, and afterwards, the Lesser Brethren. They lived in strict poverty, possessing nothing but the coarsest clothing, and depending

entirely upon alms for their food. Like the Dominicans, Francis, society grew rapidly. Francis himself was no organiser, and even deprecated organisation. But this was necessary if the movement was to last, and Gregory IX changed the original loose brotherhood into a monastic order with rules and vows and a prescribed dress. The practice of poverty was maintained for a time, and the Franciscans begged their bread as they preached, as did also the Dominicans, possibly in imitation of them. But wealth came inevitably as the order grew in size and popularity; and learning, equally despised by Francis, was also welcomed. Duns Scotus and William of Occam were Franciscans.

Francis is one of the most attractive characters in Christian history. He was a praying, singing, loving and lovable man, who looked not only on men, but also on the birds and beasts and flowers as his friends. He died in 1226, and from intense meditation on the sufferings of Christ it was believed that his body bore marks resembling the wounds of his Master.

Both orders had an immense influence. Their members worked chiefly in cities, where they strengthened the religion of the laity. They owed their authority directly to the Pope and were independent of bishops and parish clergy. Later on this became a source of much jealousy and strife, but the Friars were always a strong support to the Popes and were supported by them in turn. An important development of these orders was the institution of Tertiaries, fraternities of men and women living in the world, but keeping a strict rule of life and furthering the aims of their order.

BOOKS

H. B. Workman : *Evolution of the Monastic Ideal.* Epworth Press. 5s. Chs. v-end.

Lucy M. Smith : *The Early History of the Monastery of Cluny.*

Fr. Bede Jarrett : *Life of St Dominic.* Burns & Oates. O.p.

Fr. Cuthbert : *Life of St Francis of Assisi.* Longmans Green. 12s. 6d.

J. Cotter Morison : *Life and Times of St Bernard.*

CHAPTER XIX

SCHOLASTICISM

I

Early Schools and Teachers: Realists and Nominalists. —In the break-up of the Roman Empire it was the Church that, through its Fathers, preserved an unbroken tradition of learning since the second century. The Venerable Bede (673–735) spent a long life in study, writing and teaching. His *Church History* is a priceless gift to posterity. Shortly afterwards learning was encouraged by Charlemagne, at whose court Alcuin (735–804) taught, as Master of the Palace School. Alcuin and his companions were in no way original thinkers; but they preserved the old theology and science. A far greater figure is John Scotus, called Erigena (the Erin-born), who died about 877. Called to refute one Gottschalk, who had revived the extreme predestinarian views of Augustine, Erigena appealed fearlessly to reason. He evolved a pantheistic theology which frightened the Church and brought him into such danger that he took refuge in England. During the ninth century controversy arose on the nature of the Eucharist. Paschasius Radbertus, in his *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, taught practically Transubstantiation. His view was opposed by Ratramnus who, like Radber-

tus, was a monk of Corbey, and also by Rabanus Maurus, a disciple of Alcuin. It was not till 1215, at the Fourth Lateran Council, that Transubstantiation was formulated as a necessary dogma.

Before 900 Charlemagne's united Empire had collapsed and a period of darkness ensued all over Europe, lightened by a burst of culture at the Court of Alfred the Great (870–900). In the eleventh century Cathedral and Abbey Schools increased, especially in France, and the logic of Aristotle was applied to theology. These "schools" give rise to the name "Scholasticism," the teaching of the schools. Education was divided into two preliminary sections, called the Trivium and the Quadrivium. The Trivium included Grammar, Dialectic (or Logic) and Rhetoric (or Style). The Quadrivium comprised Geometry, Arithmetic, Astronomy and Music. These were followed by the special studies of Law, Medicine and Theology.

The greatest honour was paid to Aristotle, chiefly because his Dialectic, or science of argument, was the weapon or tool of the scholastic learning. But Plato also had followers, and the difference between the two philosophers was reflected in the controversy of Realists and Nominalists. Plato, in his doctrine of Forms, had insisted that the likenesses between things of a class pointed to a reality that existed before and independent of the individual things; that is to say, the "universal" had a real existence *ante rem*. Men who held this view were called Realists. The opposite view, that the "universal" is but a class name, with no reality of its own, but simply a nominal or verbal existence *post rem*, was supposed at first, though erroneously, to be Aristotle's teaching.

Further knowledge showed that Aristotle held the universal to have a real existence, but only in the individual thing, *in re*. Thus ultimately the Realists could claim Aristotle as their own.

The importance of the Realist and Nominalist controversy is seen in Eucharistic doctrine. Berengarius (999–1088), head of the Cathedral School at Tours, attacked the view that the elements are changed into the body and blood of Christ. He was a disciple of Erigena and a Nominalist. It is obvious that the "accidents," or qualities perceptible by sense, are not changed, and Nominalists believed in no substance, or underlying reality, which could exist independently of the accidents. Berengarius was opposed by Lanfranc of Bec, but he was protected by the great Hildebrand and came to no harm.

II

Anselm and Abélard.—This controversy awakened the Church to a new danger, the use of human reason. Another question therefore comes to the front: Which is prior, faith or reason? The Church decided for Realism, because, as Berengarius' work had shown, the faith seemed in jeopardy on any other principle. Anselm (1033–1109), the successor to Lanfranc, boldly declared Nominalism to be heretical. But Anselm went on to enunciate another principle, that faith precedes reason. "I believe in order to understand." Anselm was no opponent of inquiry; but it must take place after we have been grounded in the faith. The truths of Scripture and the dogmas of the Church form an

unchangeable basis, and further inquiry is only necessary to elucidate their meaning.

Anselm was a thinker of great ability. His chief work is a treatise on the Incarnation, *Why God became Man.* He abandoned the ancient view that the "ransom" of Christ's death was a payment made to the devil. It was rather a payment made to satisfy God's law of justice, which had been broken by man, and to which man himself could never give adequate satisfaction. Christ's satisfaction was perfect; so much so that it deserves as a reward the salvation of his brethren, the human race. The theory fails because of the feudal colouring which is given to the idea of God, and because the teaching about satisfaction, a law term introduced by Tertullian, ignores human experience, in which forgiveness often demands no satisfaction at all, but is content with a renewal of loving relations. Nevertheless Anselm's theology was an improvement on what had gone before, and it has not been completely superseded even yet.

Opposed to Anselm was Abélard (1079–1142). He studied dialectic at the Cathedral School at Paris, where he at last became Master. Driven out on account of his free opinions, he taught at St Geneviève, an abbey just outside the city, where the beginnings of the University arose in the next generation. After an interval devoted to theological study, he returned to Paris and became the most famous teacher of the age. Then troubles overwhelmed him. His love for Héloise, and the barbarous vengeance inflicted on him by her relations, is a well-known story. Added to that was an increasing opposition from other teachers and Church

leaders. The cause is not obscure. Abélard was in advance of his times. Essentially a critic, relying on reason, he lived when religious men feared reason and trusted solely to authority. "I understand in order to believe," was his motto. His methods, too, were not tactful and his personal vanity helped to make enemies. In his work *Sic et Non* he placed side by side passages of the Fathers which contradicted each other, without offering any explanation. No wonder he was considered a sower of doubts. In trying to avoid tritheism he held a doctrine of the Trinity which is almost Sabellian. He declared that what men inherited from Adam was punishment, not guilt, and that good and evil were in the motive rather than the act. He attacked Anselm's doctrine of satisfaction, regarding the Atonement as the highest expression of God's love for men, which awakens an answering love.

Abélard was no heretic, but he insisted on the use of reason. Later he was attacked by Bernard, a man thoroughly representative of his age in its best aspects. Such men, the critics and the conservatives, can never understand one another. Abélard appealed to a Synod held at Sens, in 1141, but the decision was given against him. He died the next year. His influence was enormous. The whole world," he said, "has gone out after me." No less than twenty-five Cardinals, including one Pope, and fifty bishops are said to have been among his pupils. Peter Lombard, also a pupil, composed the *Four Books of Sentences*, which are based upon Abélard's collection of patristic passages in *Sic et Non;* but in the Sentences the oppositions are explained with moderation and good sense. This

work remained the authoritative handbook of the theological study until the Reformation.

III

Height and Decline of Scholasticism.—The Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204 caused many translations of the Greek writers to be made and brought to the West. Among them came the works of Aristotle, not only the logical works which had been known before, but also the philosophical and scientific works. Alexander of Hales, an Englishman (died *c.* 1245), taught in Paris and expounded theology in the light of this full knowledge of Aristotle. Alexander joined the Franciscan order and was the first of its members to teach as a Doctor of Theology. The two greatest scholastics, Albertus Magnus and his pupil Thomas Aquinas, were Dominicans. Albertus (*c.* 1193–1280) taught at Cologne and Paris. He was the most learned man of his time and was interested in physical science as well as in theology. Thomas Aquinas (*c.* 1227–1274) taught at Paris, Rome and Bologna. His great work, the *Summa Theologiæ*, was accepted from the first as the orthodox statement of Church doctrine, and it has remained the basis of Roman Catholic theological teaching until to-day. The system of Aquinas lays down two distinct sources of knowledge, revelation and reason. Revelation includes Scripture and the interpretations of the Fathers and Church Councils. Reason is the result of the workings of the human mind in philosophy, more particularly the philosophy of Aristotle. The

aim of Aquinas was to harmonise these two. In that aim he was judged to have been successful, but this was only attained by rigidly separating the domains of revelation and reason. Whereas Anselm had attempted to prove by reason even the doctrine of the Trinity, both Albertus and Aquinas, in consequence of the monotheistic limitations of "the philosopher," Aristotle, removed this doctrine and that of the Incarnation into the sphere of revelation, whence they were to be received by faith alone. Apart from these, however, all the doctrines of the Church are examined and a bold attempt made to find a rational justification for them.

The next great teacher was a Franciscan, Duns Scotus (*c.* 1275-1308). In him the hesitation to allow all theological doctrines to become subjects for rational inquiry is carried still further. He regarded Aquinas' proof of the existence of God as worthless. Other doctrines, such as the immortality of the soul and the creation of the world out of nothing are also incapable of proof and must be received on the authority of revelation. So the scholastic philosophy, which had laboured for generations to harmonise faith and reason, begins to fail in its task.

Much controversy took place between the followers of Aquinas and Scotus, called Thomists and Scotists, not only on the above-named points, but also on the question of the will. Aquinas asserted that the will was determined by reason; God wills good because it is good. Scotus maintained an absolute freedom; good is good because God chooses it, and God's choice is arbitrary.

In William of Occam (d. 1349), another Francis-

can and a disciple of Scotus, the breakdown of Scholasticism is more evident. No theological doctrines whatever are demonstrable by reason. Theology, indeed, is not a science at all, but a practical guide to life. Occam is loyal to the Church, but contends that her teaching is beyond the sphere of reason. He revived the doctrine of Nominalism, which had long been discredited, and maintained that individual things are the only realities. His dislike of abstractions and attention to the objects of immediate perception is a premonition of the inductive method which was afterwards to be fruitful in scientific research. William was also a moral reformer and attacked the temporal power of the Papacy.

BOOKS

Hastings : *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.* See Articles on "Anselm," "Abélard," "Bernard," and general article on "Scholasticism."

Milman : *History of Latin Christianity*, Bk. VIII, ch. v., and Bk. XIV. ch. iii.

CHAPTER XX

THE UNIVERSITIES

I

Rise of Universities: Paris.—We have seen that one result of the Crusades was to widen the mental horizon of Western Europe. In the East the tradition of learning had been preserved unbroken from classical times. The West was only slowly emerging from barbarism. During the twelfth century universities were established in many cities. The *universitas* was the name for a guild of any sort, and its special application to guilds of students came later. The earlier title was *Studium generale*. The students banded themselves together for protection, appointed their own "Rectors," and hired teachers to instruct them. There had been many schools and teachers before this, but the new movement secured better organisation. The universities were not founded like monasteries, by rich men, but grew up spontaneously. In France and Germany they originated around the monastic schools. In Italy the cities, which had preserved some of the old municipal spirit throughout the barbarian invasions, formed the natural centres, and there the main study was Law, which includes both the old Roman Civil Law and the newer Canon Law of the Church. Bologna was the most important university for legal study.

The greatest of the northern universities was Paris. This was formed, it would seem, by the union of the Cathedral School, where Abélard had taught, with other more private schools. The greatest teachers gravitated to Paris, and students in thousands followed them. The teachers formed an association of their own, to which others were admitted by the presentation of a degree on proof of fitness. The students were grouped in four "nations," French, Picards, Normans and English. The method of teaching, lectures with debates, brought talent quickly to the front. The degree of Bachelor admitted to the teaching guild; that of Master was the mark of an accredited teacher. The use of Latin as the language of all learning made it possible for students and teachers to go anywhere.

Most of the students were poor. Men who did not care to fight or to trade, but had a taste for knowledge, naturally drifted to the universities in an age when the call to the monastic life was less urgently felt. They lodged together, often in squalid fashion, in the houses of the city. Later on, however, benefactors arose who founded "colleges," with "fellows" to supervise them. In England this system has changed but little even to-day. In Paris Robert de Sorbon founded in 1252 the Sorbonne, a theological school destined to have a long and famous history.

II

Oxford.—Why Oxford should have been chosen as a centre of learning no one knows. Politically

it was an important town, with a fortified castle, and the fact that Parliaments were held there would help to give it a commercial importance as well. We hear of one Vacarius who lectured there on Civil Law in Stephen's reign, but was silenced by the King. But at first Paris was far ahead of Oxford, and Englishmen, like John of Salisbury, would go to Paris to teach. During Henry II's reign Oxford grew in reputation and in the numbers of its students, and at the beginning of the thirteenth century it began to take rank with the greatest universities of the Continent. Its aspect must have been greatly different from that of to-day. Crowds of riotous, poverty-stricken boys, conspicuous mainly for their drinking, begging and quarrelling, herded together in lodging-houses. Yet among these were men who were to take a foremost place in the Church.

Teachers and scholars were alike "clerks," and for this reason free from lay responsibilities and answerable only to the bishop and his court. Oxford was in the diocese of Lincoln, and the bishop, living so far away, appointed a Chancellor to supervise on his behalf. In later days this official was appointed by the university, but at first the institution was largely ecclesiastical in character. But a free spirit prevailed within. Not only did new thought have opportunity to assert itself, however cautiously, against old tradition, but an atmosphere of democracy prevailed, entirely contrary to the feudal ideas which governed society. Within the university all were equal, rich and poor, lord and beggar. Debate was open. Every master had an equal share in making appointments. Self-government was practised, perhaps before anywhere else, in the university.

III

The Friars and the Universities.—It was the growing importance and independence of the universities which attracted the Friars to them. By the middle of the thirteenth century the University of Paris was at its height, with privileges, endowments and self-government. It was a small State within the State. The Friars aspired to wield this power. They were by their very constitution strong supporters of the Papacy, and they could count on Papal support and favour for themselves. There was, in addition, the desire to uphold orthodox opinion, which was strong among the Dominicans, whose order had been founded for the suppression of heresy. But Paris did not at first welcome the new-comers. A riot which happened in 1228 gave them the entry they desired. In the not uncommon strife between town and gown two scholars had been killed by the city guard. Satisfaction was demanded and refused. The University in return suspended its lectures and many of its scholars migrated to other cities. The Dominicans seized the opportunity and obtained leave to teach theology. When the University returned, it found them in possession, and a long struggle began. After thirty years the Dominicans won, partly through Papal Bulls, but also by sheer merit; for men like Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas were clearly the outstanding men of their time.

The Franciscans by their original rule of absolute poverty would have been excluded from learning altogether, for learning needs books and leisure.

"I am your breviary," St Francis said jestingly when refusing the request of a novice for a Psalter. But preaching, even popular preaching, cannot go far without some theology, and the Franciscans were forced to learn. Under the generalship of Bonaventura (1221–1274) the Franciscans became definitely an order of piety and learning. They were prominent at Oxford in the thirteenth century, and some of the great Parisian teachers, like Alexander of Hales, belonged to their order.

Perhaps the greatest of all the Franciscans, and one who stands in a class apart as a scientist rather than a theologian, was Roger Bacon. He studied at Oxford under Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, for whom he had an extraordinary admiration. Of other teachers, however, he thought very little, and constantly attacked their indifference to accuracy and truth. He spent much money on buying books and making scientific experiments. But his temper was not that of his age, and his criticisms, which would seem natural enough to-day, only brought suspicion upon himself. Finally he joined the Franciscans who forbade him to write. Pope Clement IV (1265–1268), however, was interested in his discoveries and gave him permission to write, but could furnish no money. Nevertheless Bacon composed his *Opus maius*, a review of all knowledge, in which he pointed out better methods of acquiring knowledge and avoiding errors. Few took any notice of him. He was, as he says in one of his characteristic complaints, "unheard, forgotten, buried." The age of science was not yet.

BOOKS

Hastings Rashdall: *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*. Oxford Press. O.p.

F. J. Foakes Jackson: *An Introduction to the History of Christianity*, A.D. 590-1314, ch. ix.

CHAPTER XXI

THE PAPACY FROM 1122 TO THE DAWN OF NATIONALISM

I

The Struggle with the Hohenstaufen.—After the Concordat of Worms a period of peace ensued between Empire and Papacy. Lothar, who succeeded Henry V as Emperor in 1125, treated the Popes with tact and moderation. In 1137 he died, and Conrad of Hohenstaufen was elected Emperor. With the advent of this family to the imperial throne the long struggle soon broke out afresh.

Conrad was succeeded in 1152 by his nephew Frederick, called Barbarossa. Two years after, in 1154, Hadrian IV, an Englishman, was made Pope. Hadrian at once renewed the lofty tone and pretensions of Hildebrand. He plainly hinted that he regarded the Emperor as a feudal subject, holding his power by grant of the Pope. This claim Frederick keenly resented. But Hadrian had difficulties in Rome. The communal spirit, already vigorous in the cities of Northern Italy, had revived at Rome the memories of ancient republican glory. It was opposed to Emperor and Pope alike, when either asserted an autocratic overlordship. At Rome Arnold of Brescia, an eager, high-minded champion of new political ideas and a preacher of moral reform in the Church, a disciple of Abélard, took the side

of the citizens and became a source of anxiety to Hadrian. In order to crush him, Hadrian softened his manner towards Frederick, who in return caused Arnold to be delivered up by a noble who was sheltering him. Arnold was then burned. But Frederick was unable to remain in Italy, and when he retired to Germany the Papal power increased. Matters went so far that Hadrian was about to excommunicate Frederick, in 1159, but before he could do so he died.

There was strife about the election of a new Pope. The partisans of the Emperor among the Cardinals chose Victor IV, while the majority chose Alexander III, who was known to be likely to continue the policy of Hadrian. Alexander secured the support of England and France, but was forced to fly from Italy. For three years he lived in France, acting as Pope and gradually strengthening his position. Victor IV died in 1164 and the schism might have been healed, but Frederick caused a second anti-Pope, Pascal III, to be appointed. In 1165, when Frederick was busy in Germany, Alexander felt strong enough to return to Rome. He was obliged, however, to retire again in 1167, when Frederick came to Italy with a large army. Just when Alexander's position seemed desperate, the Emperor's army was attacked by a deadly fever, which carried off hundreds of nobles and a large part of his soldiery. With the remnants he was barely able to retire over the Alps. Not until 1177 did he return, and then he was met with such resistance from the Lombard cities that he was forced to make peace, conceding almost all that Alexander had struggled for. It was a great victory for the Pope.

But the contest was not yet over. Frederick went on a Crusade after the fall of Jerusalem in 1187, and was drowned in Cilicia the next year. His son Henry VI continued the Hohenstaufen policy. Though opposed by Pope Celestine III he wielded enormous power and even aimed at making the Empire a hereditary possession for his family. He died, however, in 1197 at the age of thirty-two, leaving his infant son Frederick to the care of the Pope. At the same time Innocent III ascended the Papal throne. He was a man of personal humility and piety, but of the highest ambitions for his office. It was he who in his dispute with King John laid England under an interdict and afterwards made the King promise to hold his kingdom as a fief of the Papacy. In France he forced Philip Augustus to take back the wife whom he had divorced. But his chief struggle was with the Empire. There were two claimants, Philip, brother of Henry VI, and Otto, a German noble favoured by Richard I of England as an enemy of the Hohenstaufen. The Pope, who was pledged to support the claims of the infant Frederick, wavered for a time. Finally he sided with Otto. Ten years of civil war followed. Philip was about to triumph when he was murdered in 1208 and Otto became Emperor.

II

Victory of the Papacy.—Once in power, Otto opposed the Papacy. In desperation, the Pope was obliged to turn to Frederick, now grown to be a young man. Thus the Hohenstaufen enter the

contest again. Otto had estranged many by severe government. Frederick boldly claimed the throne, and Germany gradually came to his side. By 1214, after the battle of Bouvines, in which Otto was defeated by Philip of France, Frederick was acknowledged as Emperor.

It was not until 1220 that the new Emperor was crowned at Rome. The condition of his coronation was that he should go on a Crusade. This was accomplished, after many delays, in 1228. But the temper and policy of Frederick II was strongly opposed to the Papacy. He made a treaty with the Saracens which, although it gave Christians practical control of Jerusalem,[1] was strongly denounced by a new Pope, Gregory IX. He was anxious also to establish the Empire on a hereditary basis and to join with it both Northern and Southern Italy, so as to encircle the Papal States. His personal views on religion were, it would seem, far from orthodox. Accordingly, Gregory excommunicated him and did his best to stir up a "Crusade" against him. It was not very successful, and both sides consented to a peace in 1230. Nine years after the struggle broke out afresh, but in 1241 the aged Gregory died.

Innocent IV, following the same policy, fled to Lyons, where he held a Council and deposed Frederick. The strife was now carried on by both antagonists with remorseless bitterness. To the Pope it seemed that nothing less than the destruction of the whole house of Hohenstaufen would suffice, and any means that might compass that end were taken without scruple. In 1250 Frederick

[1] See p. 136.

died. His last years saw a weakening of his power. His son Conrad IV was still less able to hold his own against the forces which the Papacy could move against him. When he too died in 1254 his son Conradin was but an infant. Meanwhile Innocent had died, and a new influence appeared in Papal elections. Both Urban IV (1261–1264) and Clement IV (1265–1268) were Frenchmen. Italy and Sicily were held and well governed by Manfred, an illegitimate son of Frederick II. Innocent IV had offered this kingdom to Edmund, son of Henry III of England, who had paid a large sum for it. But as the English were slow in fighting the Papal battles, Urban IV transferred the offer to Charles of Anjou, brother of Louis IX of France. Charles defeated and killed Manfred. Conradin, a lad of seventeen, bravely attempted to recover his ancestral inheritance, but was defeated by Charles in 1268 and mercilessly executed after the battle. Thus ended the line of Hohenstaufen.

III

Growth of National Feeling.—The Papacy had apparently triumphed. Henceforth the Empire counts for less and less in European affairs. But the later Popes had fought an unworthy fight, with motives and weapons far inferior to those of Hildebrand or even of Innocent III. The policy reacted upon their office, which began to lose the respect of religiously-minded men. The Papal dream of world-dominion was no nearer fulfilment. Many, indeed, began to reflect that Empire was not the

true business of the Church. Englishmen had risen up against King John and the Pope who supported him. In the cities of Europe a wealthy and intelligent middle class was coming to the front. As the thirteenth century closes we see a new struggle beginning, not between Pope and Emperor, but between the Pope and the nations.

Philip the Fair (1285–1314), the despotic King of France, was at war with the ambitious Edward I of England. Both needed money, and both included the clergy as well as the laity in their taxation. Boniface VIII (1294–1303) replied with the Bull *Clericis laicos*, which claimed that all Church property was in the Pope's hands and that no temporal ruler could tax it for any purpose. Edward treated the clergy as outlaws, since they refused to share the common burdens. Philip cut off the Papal revenues by forbidding the export of money from France. Finally the clergy were allowed to make voluntary contributions, but the real victory rested with the kings.

In 1301 Philip arrested and charged with treason a Papal messenger. Boniface ordered his release, but Philip summoned his States-General, nobles, clergy and commons, and obtained their support, Boniface then published the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, which declared that "it is necessary to salvation for every human being to be subject to the Roman Pontiff." Philip retaliated by an act of brutal violence. He sent a force of soldiers and made Boniface a prisoner. He was soon rescued, but mind and body were alike broken and a month later he died.

Thus as the fourteenth century opens the Papacy,

victorious over the Empire, is faced by new rivals. In the nations now growing to self-consciousness criticisms are being heard which come to their full effect at the Reformation.

BOOKS

Cambridge Mediæval History, Vol. V.
Ugo Balzani : *The Popes and the Hohenstaufen.*
W. Barry : *The Papal Monarchy from St Gregory the Great to Boniface VIII.* Fisher Unwin. 7s. 6d.

IMPORTANT DATES

POPES	EMPERORS	COUNCILS, ETC.
	Antoninus Pius, 138-161	
Victor, 189-198	M. Aurelius Ant., 161-180	
Callistus, 217-222		
Fabian, 236-250	Decius, 249-251	
Stephen, 254-257	Valerian, 253-260	
	Aurelian, 270-275	
	Diocletian, 284-305	
Sylvester I, 314-335	Constantine, 312-337	Nicæa, 325
	Constantius, 337-360	
	Constans, 337-351	
Damasus, 366-384	Gratian, 367-383	
	Theodosius, 379-395	Constantinople, 381
Innocent I, 402-417	Valentinian III, 424-455	Ephesus, 431
Leo I, 440-461		Chalcedon, 451
Gelasius I, 492-496	Anastasius I, 491-518	
		Constantinople (II),553
Gregory I, 590-604	Maurice, 592-602	
	Phocas, 602-610	
		Constantinople (III), 680-681
Gregory III, 731-741	Leo the Isaurian, 717-741	
Zacharias, 741-752	Constantine V, 741-775	
	[Western]	
Stephen III, 752-755	Pippin, 751-768	
Hadrian I, 772-795	Charlemagne, 768-771 Carloman	Nicæa (II), 787
	Charlemagne, 771-814	
Leo III, 795-816		
Nicholas I, 858-867	Louis II, 850-875	
	Henry the Fowler, 916-936	
	Otto I, 936-973	
John XII, 955-964	Otto III, 993-1002	
Sylvester II, 999-1003	Henry III, 1039-1056	
Gregory VI, 1045-1046		
Leo IX, 1049-1054		
Victor II, 1054-1057	Henry IV, 1056-1106	
Nicholas II, 1059-1061		
Alexander II, 1061-1073		
Gregory VII, 1073-1085		
Urban II, 1088-1099		Synod of Clermont, 1095

POPES	EMPERORS	COUNCILS, ETC.
Paschal II, 1099-1118	Henry V, 1106-1125	
Calixtus II, 1119-1124		Concordat of Worms, 1122
		First Lateran Council, 1123
Innocent II, 1130-1143	Lothar, 1125-1137	
	Conrad III, 1137-1152	Second Lateran Council, 1139
Hadrian IV, 1154-1159	Frederick I, 1152-1190	
Alexander III, 1159-1181		Third Lateran Council, 1179
Celestine III, 1191-1198	Henry VI, 1190-1197	
	Philip II, 1197-1208	Fourth Lateran Council, 1215
Innocent III, 1198-1216	Otto IV, 1208-1214	
Honorius III, 1216-1227	Frederick II, 1214-1250	
Gregory IX, 1227-1241		
Innocent IV, 1243-1254		First Council of Lyons, 1245
Urban IV, 1261-1264		
Clement IV, 1265-1268		
Gregory X, 1271-1276	Rudolph of Hapsburg, 1273-1291	Second Council of Lyons, 1274
Boniface VIII, 1294-1303	Adolph of Nassau, 1291-1298	

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
THE EDINBURGH PRESS, 9 AND 11 YOUNG STREET, EDINBURGH

DATE DUE

BR 162 .B85 1928

Butterworth, George William,
1879-

A study of church history to
the end of the thirteenth

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BR162.B85 1928
Butterworth, A study of church history
3 0645 0005 3627 2